DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 529 AL 002 073

By-Lance, Donald M.
A Brief Study of Spanish-English Bilingualism: Final Report, Research Project ORR-Liberal Arts-15504.
Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Coll. of Liberal Arts.
Spons Agency-Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Research Council.
Report No-RP-ORR-LA-15504
Pub Date 25 Aug 69
Note-102p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.20
Descriptors-*Bilingualism, *English (Second Language), Foreign Students, *Interference (Language Learning), Language Development, *Mexican Americans, Nonstandard Dialects, Spanish Speaking, Standard Spoken Usage

The five papers in this report present partial analyses of data collected for an exploratory research project. The five papers are: (1) "Discussion of Research Procedures and General Observations Regarding Bilingualism," Donald M. Lance; (2) "Some Comments on the English of Eight Bilinguals," Gail McBride Smith; (3) "Analysis of the English of Four Spanish-Speaking Foreign Students," Barbara Taylor Ward; (4) "Dialectal and Nonstandard Forms in Texas Spanish," Donald M. Lance; and (5) "The Mixing of English and Spanish," Donald M. Lance. Dr. Lance has also written a section "Conclusions and Implications." He concludes that the cause of the nonstandard English usage of bilinguals is not only Spanish interference but also language development, particularly in children, and the use of dialect forms that are also common throughout the "Anglo" and Negro communities. Evidence also indicates that when Mexican-Americans mix English and Spanish together in the same sentence the result is not a creolized language but instead a very relaxed and arbitrary switching of codes, both of which are available for use at any time. Appendices give a list of interviewers and informants, incidence of mixing of English and Spanish, and a non-parametric statistical analysis of the word-count in Appendix II. (DO)

ED0 32529

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A BRIEF STUDY OF SPANISH-ENGLISH BILINGUALISM:

FINAL REPORT, RESEARCH PROJECT ORR-LIBERAL ARTS-15504

DONALD M. LANCE

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE STATION, TEXAS

AUGUST 25, 1969

AL 002 073

A BRIEF STUDY OF SPANISH-ENGLISH BILINGUALISM:
FINAL REPORT, RESEARCH PROJECT ORR-LIBERAL ARTS-15504

DONALD M. LANCE
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE STATION, TEXAS

AUGUST 25, 1969

PREFACE

This project was sponsored by the Research Council of Texas A&M University, with the financial support provided by the University's Fund for Organized Research. It constitutes a part of research project ORR-Liberal Arts-69, Account 15504, administered by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, with funds for this portion of the overall project allocated to the Department of English.

The basic aim chosen for this study was to make an exploratory investigation of Spanish-English bilingualism from the linguist's point of view, with pedagogical implications made subordinate so that the research could be directed toward the garnering of facts. In view of the fact-finding aspect of the study, it was decided that a minimum of research into the literature would be included in the final report itself.

Another reason for not including footnotes, etc. here is that the reading audience will include both linguists and non-specialists. I hope that we have not caused reading problems for the latter group by using too much technical terminology. Further, I recognize the possibility that the findings of this research, as well as our conclusions, may replicate the findings of other linguistic studies that are not cited here.

Expression of appreciation must be extended not only to Frank W. R. Hubert, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and to Lee J. Martin, Head of the Department of English, for the financial support that made the study possible, but to a number of other people as well.

First, my deepest appreciation must be extended to the informants who agreed to give of their time and language so that the study could be made and to the Reverend Osmundo Corrales for introducing us to one of the most friendly, helpful groups of people I have met.

I particularly want to thank Professors Rudy Troike of the University of Texas and Riley Smith of Texas A&M University for discussing with me many of the ideas presented and used in this study and for reading portions of the manuscript for the final report. Many others, such as Professor Muriel Saville of Texas A&M University, have contributed much by means of informal discussions and would have done much more had time permitted.

Gustavo González, of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in Austin, Texas, was of invaluable help in sharing his ideas and experiences with me, both in conversations and by means of his publications. He also very kindly let us use a preliminary copy of a report being prepared on the English of migrant children.

The staff of the research team contributed much more that the two papers included in this report, for the Graduate Assistants helped in numerous other ways, such as securing bibliographical materials to use in the study. Also, Miss Herlinda Rodríguez and Mrs. Janice Want were most helpful in agreeing to type portions of the final report at a very busy time in the summer term.

Carmen Reyna, the project secretary, was simply indispensable. She not only prepared typescripts of the tapes and provided general secretarial assistance, as one would expect, but more importantly, she did some of the interviewing and always graciously and very capably served as a native informant with the reservoir of knowledge about Mexican-American culture and language that is available only in a Mexican-American.

D. M. L.
8-25-69

CONTENTS

I. Discussion of Research Procedures and General Observations Regarding Bilingualism (Donald M. Lance) 1

II. Some Comments on the English of Eight Bilinguals (Gail McBride Smith) 17

III. Analysis of the English of Four Spanish-Speaking Foreign Students (Barbara Taylor Ward) 25

IV. Dialectal and Nonstandard Forms in Texas Spanish (Donald M. Lance) 45

V. The Mixing of English and Spanish (Donald M. Lance) 69

VI. Conclusions and Implications (Donald M. Lance) 91

APPENDIX I. List of Interviewers and Informants 97

APPENDIX II. Incidence of Mixing of English and Spanish 101

APPENDIX III. A Non-Parametric Statistical Analysis of the Word-Count in Appendix II (David W. Smith) 103

I. DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND GENERAL OBSERVATIONS REGARDING BILINGUALISM

By Donald M. Lance

The five papers in this report present partial analyses of data collected for an exploratory research project conducted in Bryan, Texas, during the spring and summer of 1969 under the sponsorship of the Research Council of Texas A&M University. The principal informants for the project were three generations of a Spanish-speaking family, including the paternal grandparents (aged 58 and 55), born in small towns in South Texas, neither having received any formal education, the grandfather having a minimal fluency in English and the grandmother none; the parents (aged 33 and 28), born in the San Antonio and Houston areas respectively and residents of Bryan for about 15 years, the father having received four years of schooling and the mother three, both being bilingual since childhood, the father seeming to have a slight Spanish dominance and the mother perhaps a slight English dominance apparently because of their employment history; and four children, a girl (aged 12) in the fifth grade, a boy (aged 11) in the fourth grade, and a boy and a girl (aged 9 and 8) in the second grade. Several other informants were used also, for purposes that will be discussed later. (The background of the other informants also will be given later, as needed.)

The informants were selected with the help of the minister of a Spanish-speaking Protestant church in Bryan. The minister was asked to recommend a "representative" working-class bilingual family--one that speaks Spanish in the home and displays neither inordinate economic "success" nor significant domestic or legal difficulties of a personal nature. The subjective evaluation of the family by the author complemented that of the minister. The first interview was conducted with the minister present so as to set an informal, non-pedagogical tone for the subsequent interviews. Considering the limited goals of the research project, the interviews were successful, though by no means could one say that enough data was collected--nor even solicited--to be regarded as a cross-section sampling of the Spanish of Bryan, Texas, and by no stretch of the imagination as the linguistic behavior of all Mexican-Americans.

The main purpose of this first paper is to make certain observations about bilingualism in Texas and some of the problems attendant thereto--not all of which are problems solely for the Mexican-American himself--and to present a broader interpretation of bilingualism than the author has seen in previous studies of the language situation in communities such as Bryan. The ideas presented in the paper are based not only on the interviews conducted for this project but also on the previous experience of the author himself, a native of South Texas who learned Spanish from farm laborers as well as from textbooks and who taught Spanish and English in Texas high schools for seven years. Specific analyses of the language data collected in the interviews are presented in the other papers in this report.

The interview technique consisted of almost totally unstructured conversation--that is, unstructured insofar as specific usages were concerned. The motivation of this approach was to allow the interviewer to avoid any possibility of getting "careful" speech filled with hyper-forms and "planned" answers. Before the interviews, the author explained to the informants that we simply wanted to study the spoken English and Spanish of three generations of the same family to see what differences and similarities could be detected. So as to win the approval of the two older generations, an oblique reference was made to a better understanding of the problems associated with educating Spanish-speaking children, though both the interviewers and the informants were fully aware that this limited study could not produce enough data for the ultimate statement on bilingual education per se. The informants were told that one of the principal objectives was to see how strongly they depended on borrowed words in each language. It was felt that a questionnaire or even an informal but linguistically controlled set of topics or questions might be interpreted by the informants as a test of some sort--either of their knowledge of vocabulary items or of the "goodness" or "badness" of their dialect. Since this study is strictly exploratory and does not pretend to be a cross-sectional sampling of either Mexican-American Spanish or English, there appeared to be little motivation for highly selective vocabulary, phonological, and syntactic data; rather, the purpose of the study was to get the informants to talk freely in both languages just to see what comments could be made about the grammar and phonology of each language.

The most significant questions explored in this project--principally because some of them do not seem to have been formally posed in previous research with Spanish-English bilinguals--were (1) the facility with which each generation uses Spanish and/or English, (2) the extent and the nature of the deviations from "standard" Spanish in the language of each generation, (3) the amount of borrowing that occurs when the informants speak only Spanish or only English, and (4) the nature and amount of their "errors" in English. In view of the fact that much of the previous writing about bilingual speakers' problems depends heavily on "interference" phenomena, several college students from the Dominican Republic were also interviewed in English so that a comparison could be made between their performance and that of the Bryan residents, since the role of interference in the English of the foreign students would be rather clear and rather strong.

The initial intention of the research team--whose names are listed in Appendix I--was to conduct interviews with all the informants in both Spanish and English, with the Graduate Assistants doing most of the interviewing in English and the

Principal Investigator doing the interviewing in Spanish; unfortunately, however, time and circumstances did not allow total fulfillment of that intention. Although the entire family was extremely open, friendly, and helpful, the author was never able to get the children to speak Spanish with him even though they obviously understood him when he spoke with them in Spanish; likewise, when he attempted to talk English with the grandfather--albeit after a rather successful session in Spanish--the latter exhibited considerable discomfort and continued to respond in Spanish. Because of limitations of time, and out of consideration for the informants' apparent feeling, they were not forced to perform the difficult task of engaging in a conversation that was so obviously discomfiting, though the research team felt that with more time and some subtle maneuvering it could very likely have gotten all of them to use both languages with a reasonable degree of comfort.

Altogether four interview sessions were held with various members of the family, all conducted in their homes. In the first session, the author and the minister-friend conducted two twenty-minute interviews with the parents, one in English and one in Spanish; then the author and Mrs. Smith, one of the Graduate Assistants on the project, interviewed the four children in English. In the second session, Mrs. Smith interviewed the children in English again for about fifty minutes while the author interviewed the mother and a neighbor for about fifteen minutes in English, about thirty minutes in Spanish, and about twenty minutes in a rather relaxed conversation in which a mixture of English and Spanish was used; Mrs. Smith also attempted to get the children to talk among themselves in Spanish for about ten minutes, though with little success, as the two older children kept lapsing into English, and the youngest one declined even to try; the nine-year-old boy cooperated most willingly but experienced more difficulty in telling his story than he had displayed in the English interviews. In the third session, the author interviewed the paternal grandparents and their sixteen-year-old daughter in Spanish for about fifty minutes and then attempted to interview all three in English but was unsuccessful in getting either of the grandparents to speak more than a few isolated words in English; the daughter, however, spoke freely in English with markedly less reluctance than she had displayed in the Spanish interview. In the fourth session the author was accompanied by the secretary of the project, María del Carmen Reyna, a senior at Texas A&M University who was born in Matamoros, Tamaulipas, Mexico, and attended school both in Matamoros and in Brownsville, Texas; she is a secondary education major with teaching majors in Spanish and English and uses both languages fluently with ease, having only a slight accent in English. In the interview session, Miss Reyna interviewed the children in Spanish while the author was interviewing the mother and the neighbor again in mixed English and Spanish. Partial analyses of the data collected, as well as general comments, are presented below and in the other four papers in this report. Brief conclusions are given in Paper VI.

The topics discussed in the interviews with the adults included such matters as where they had lived, the kind of work they have done, how certain foods are prepared, where they have gone on vacations, and the names of certain pieces of furniture. The children were asked to talk about their favorite television programs, school activities, and vacations and to tell stories that they liked or knew. Ideally, the research team should have returned for additional interviews to fill in the gaps in the data after the tapes were transcribed and analyzed; because of limitations of time, however, this was not possible, and the goals of the project--exploration rather than definitive description--did not absolutely demand that much detail anyway.

Of the questions listed above as bases for this research project, the one that is most crucial to understanding bilingualism in Texas is the first one, the facility with which each generation uses the two languages in question. As suspected, however, the answer to the question is much more complex than earlier literature has suggested, and the interviews revealed no justification for the often-made assertion that Mexican-Americans in Texas speak neither English nor Spanish but, instead, a random, grammarless mixture of the two, pejoratively referred to as "Tex-Mex"; an alleged "frequent result" is "that they become not bilingual but nearly nonlingual," as expressed in "The Little Strike That Grew to La Causa," Time, XCIV (July 4, 1969), 20-21. In the remainder of this paper, some of the author's personal experiences on the project will be used to show some evidence of the complexity of the question; the other three questions listed above will be discussed in the other papers in this report.

It is interesting that the first and third generations in the family had totally opposite reactions to speaking English and Spanish with the author. As he attempted to engage the grandfather in a conversation in English, the latter's responses were mostly in Spanish, though it was obvious that he had little if any difficulty in understanding what was said; obversely, the children either remained inexplicably mute or responded in English when the author talked with them in Spanish. As the members of each generation evaded answering in the "difficult" language, their vocal responses were accompanied by nervous laughter, eye evasion, and other kinesic behavior indicative of psychological discomfort. Both generations were in the presence of the author as he was conducting interviews and informal conversation with others in the "difficult" language, and in both situations various behavioral reactions--such as laughter and facial expressions--indicated a very high degree of understanding of both languages. Even the grandmother, who maintained that she could speak "ni una palabra en inglés," appeared to understand a considerable amount of the interview with her sixteen-year-old daughter; and when the author handed her a small gift with the comment that it was "un regalito para la familia," she reflexively replied "Thank you." As well, the children appeared to understand everything that was being said as their parents were being interviewed in Spanish. Since videotapes were not used to record the facial reactions of the listening informants, however, concrete evidence of their understanding is limited to a relatively small amount of background noise on the tapes.

In the fourth interview session, after Miss Reyna had interviewed the children in Spanish, the author attempted to do so. As soon as he indicated that that was his intention, they found excuses to leave the room, but the two older children were talked into sitting down, though they continued to respond to his Spanish questions--which they understood with no apparent difficulty--with silence and eye evasion or with very softly uttered responses in English or mixed English and Spanish. After a brief period of questioning, the author decided to cease "torturing" them and then had an unrecorded discussion with the eleven-year-old boy about why they were reluctant to speak Spanish with him. When asked why they could talk Spanish with Miss Reyna but not with the author, the two children merely shrugged their shoulders, and when asked if they were reluctant because he was an Anglo they reponded with eye evasion. Finally the eleven-year-old boy said that it was "too hard" to talk Spanish under these circumstances--and from his prior and subsequent behavior it was obvious that he did not mean either that it was difficult to speak with the author at all or that he was worried about making errors. Upon further questioning he also said that if necessary he could speak Spanish with either of us if we were his teachers but that it would be much easier to talk Spanish with Miss Reyna; however, he also indicated that in school it would be harder to speak Spanish than English with either of us.

In the second interview session, when Mrs. Smith asked the children to speak Spanish among themselves, all except the nine-year-old boy used almost as much English as Spanish. He was very eager to talk Spanish, but he was obviously under considerable strain while doing so. He chose to tell the story of the three bears, which had been told in English during a previous interview, but he got the story mixed up while trying to tell it in Spanish and had the bears saying what Goldilocks was supposed to say. (More comments on the informants' use of Spanish appear in Paper IV.)

In a private conversation with the author, Gustavo González, a graduate student at the University of Texas at Austin, has reported similar experiences in his research. While conducting interviews with young children in Brownsville, Texas, he found that the longer the child has been in school the more reluctant he is to speak Spanish, in spite of obvious facility in the use of the language. Also, when he was teaching a kindergarten class for a practicum course in Austin during the summer of 1969, the children at first refused to believe the he could actually speak Spanish, apparently because he was wearing a coat and tie.

From these two sets of experiences, one can see that the situation is not simply, as one would suspect, a reluctance to speak Spanish with an Anglo. Each language seems to have its own social domain, and deviations from the expected use of Spanish are interpreted by school children as anomolous behavior. One is tempted also to suspect that the author has an English accent that served as an inhibitory influence, but evidence to the contrary is a comment made quite sincerely by the sixteen-year-old informant: "¿Usted no es parte mejicano? ... Parece que es." Thus, neither the speaker's ethnic origin (physiological features) nor accent alone can fully explain listener reactions; in Austin at least, kindergarten children place a Mexican-American wearing a coat and tie in somewhat the same category as an English-speaking person. Undoubtedly the sociolinguistic conditioning that children receive in school inhibits their willingness to speak Spanish in any except the most relaxed or familiar interpersonal relationships, and the factors discussed here need to be subjected to further investigation and consideration in connection with such matters as teacher selection and training, curriculum development, etc. for bilingual instructional programs. This stereotyping of Anglos and suit-wearers should not be interpreted as culturally endemic or a permanent phenomenon, for both Mr. González and the author found that the children's initial reluctance gradually abated, with Mr. González having more success in this respect than the author.

Not only familiarity but also child-adult relationships appear to operate in the child's willingness to speak freely, with women perhaps having an advantage over men, though the professional roles of the two men discussed here also must be taken into consideration. Mrs. Smith tried only briefly to get the children to speak Spanish, but she was more successful than the author, even though she does not speak the language; she also was considerably more successful in getting them to speak freely in English. Two other variables must also be considered, however, in interpreting this contrast: they knew the author as "the professor" and they knew Mrs. Smith as one of the former teachers at the junior high school which they would later attend and as one of their sixteen-year-old aunt's favorite teachers. Though Miss Reyna is a young and very personable native speaker of Spanish, she was not as successful in getting the children to "open up" in Spanish as Mrs. Smith was in English, perhaps because she was inexperienced as an interviewer but also undoubtedly because she was known as the project secretary and thus as someone from the University. All three interviewers were equally successful in getting the adults to speak freely in either English or Spanish.

If this family is representative of a very large number of the Spanish-surname population of the Southwest, and the author thinks it is, it reveals a very rapid sociological development spanning these respective three generations throughout the area. Longitudinal and cross-sectional linguistic studies are also likely to reveal in the same three respective generations the makings of some theoretically interesting diachronic phonological, morphological, and lexical changes in the subdialects spoken in the area. These language changes will receive some indirect attention in the following papers, but for the most part the analyses will be strictly synchronic. Occasional comments of a sociological nature will also be made.

The assertion that this family is representative does not mean, of course, that all Mexican-American families are like this one in all respects; rather, the major linguistic, attitudinal, and sociological trends present in the Southwest are reflected in this group. In this family the oldest generation is more strongly Mexican-oriented, both culturally and linguistically, than their progeny, and the children are becoming even more anglicized than their parents. The historical explanation for this trend is the acceleration of integration of Anglo and Mexican-American life during and shortly after World War II, especially the elimination of separate schools. Because of time and circumstances, there are members of the second generation of many such families that are at least as strongly anglicized as the third generation in this group of informants; likewise, because of other circumstances, there are many families in which the third generation is even more "Mexican" than the first generation of this one, particularly along the border.

Variations in degree of anglicization can be seen in individuals within single families, and not surprisingly they were found in this group of informants. The father's facility in English is more limited than his wife's, and in the subjective judgement of the author he appears to be more "Mexican" is his mannerisms. He has worked as a semi-skilled employee for a local soft drink bottling plant for twelve years and thus has been exposed mostly to working-class East Central Texas white and Negro English; his wife, on the other hand, has worked as a maid for middle class families and has had to answer the telephone and thus has had economic motivation for "standardizing" ("improving") her English. There were also some differences in the children. The nine-year-old boy, who appears to be extremely close to his father, behaves differently from his siblings, and he does so in the same way that his father differs from his wife: his English is very much like his father's, and he is much less reluctant to speak Spanish, as was his father at first. An easy explanation for the girls' more strongly anglicized behavior is that they predictably would identify with their mother and with their (Anglo) teachers. The eleven-year-old boy, rather than specifically rejecting his father's proclivities, simply has adopted an extra-familial orientation, as is evidenced by his very successful participation in Little League baseball, his speech, and certain behavior traits that lend themselves only to somewhat subjective interpretation. The age group that manifests the greatest linguistic and cultural diversity in the experience of the author is males between fourteen and twenty, but unfortunately there were no informants from that group in this project. In this age group there is rather clear polarization into at least two distinct types: those who acquiesce in following the apparent desires of the dominant elements of middle-class America and those who rebel linguistically and socially.

Probably the strongest but least clearly understood reason why Mexican-Americans in Texas are condemned for speaking the "nonlingual" Tex-Mex is that both in public and in private they often speak a mixture of English and Spanish. As well, particularly when speaking the mixture, their speech has an unusually high number of English borrowings and a high amount of nonstandard morphology in the verb system. As suggested above, the mixture is used when the social situation is ambiguous as to etiquette, but the speaker's personal history and ethnic and linguistic orientation also are involved. For instance, Miss Reyna, who did not start learning English until she was in the third grade, cannot switch from one language to the other in the middle of a sentence as freely as the second- and third-generation informants on the project can. Also, a neighbor who was interviewed alongside Lupe used considerably more English than Spanish in the mixed interviews, undoubtedly because when she was seven her mother died and her father married an Anglo, whereupon the family had to speak only Enlgish at home; she continued to speak only English at home after marriage, though she had to re-learn Spanish because her mother-in-law could not speak English. It is often suggested and even overtly stated, that the reason why these speakers switch from one language to the other in the middle of a sentence is that they have impoverished vocabularies in both languages; a more acceptable explanation, however, was offered by one of the women in an unrecorded conversation with the author: while speaking, the person is "thinking" somewhat simultaneously in both languages and the word that comes out is the one that is "closest to the tip of the tongue." This matter is discussed in more detail in Paper V.

A very common observation made by both Anglos and Mexican-Americans is that in Texas a rather large number of people speak a mixture of Spanish and English that cannot be called either English or Spanish. Neither the author's prior experience nor the results of the research support that position. (Almost invariably, when this charge is made of Mexican-Americans, the first-and often only-example is the use of troca when there is a perfectly good Spanish word camión; the accusers, however, never say that Texas English has been corrupted by the borrowing of plaza in naming shopping centers when the good English word mall and the even more elegant French loan word centre are available or that porch, piazza, yard, stoop, garden, veranda, or terrace should be used instead of the Spanish word patio.) Rather than being "nonlingual"--a patently absurd claim anyway--the "Tex-Mex" speaker merely has a highly versatile linguistic competence encompassing a dialect of English, a dialect of Spanish, and the ability to use a mixture of the two when the social situation is ambiguous as to the choice of language or dialect for etiquette purposes. The informants in this project, particularly the second generation, can--and did--speak strictly Spanish when asked to do so and strictly English when asked to do so; and they also spoke the mixture rather freely after becoming aware that it was of interest to the project and, more important, that the research team did not frown upon its use.

Undoubtedly, borrowings like troca (but not patio) are related to language switching. When an individual English word is used in an otherwise Spanish sentence, it is adapted morphologically and phonologically to the rules of Spanish. At the same time semantic shifts occur in the dialect, such as camión being used alongside [bos] or [bus] or [bəs] to signify a carrier of people in contradistinction to a truck. The same process takes place in English, with patio, for instance, using the vowel / æ / and taking the plural / -z /, besides having a somewhat different meaning because of the architectural differences found in the two cultures. The range of borrowings is much more limited in Texas English than in Texas Spanish.

Even more "self-damning" than the Mexican-Americans' linguistic performance is the mere fact that the vast majority of the group are on a considerably lower socio-economic level than Anglos, and thus Spanish has become a much less prestigious medium for social intercourse than English. As a result, in institutionalized education, run by the dominant element of society, the child is conditioned to regard Spanish as economically counter-productive as well as socially inelegant in public life. As a consequence of this orientation and his family's continued use of Spanish, the young Mexican-American develops an ambivalent attitude toward the language and begins to abandon it in favor of English for public purposes, though he continues to use it in the privacy of family and peer-group environments. He begins to "think in English" and thus increases the possibility that the English word may be "closest to the tip of his tongue" while he is speaking either language, with the use of English inevitably affecting his Spanish. After these convenient ad hoc "borrowings" are used a great number of times, their use becomes automatic, their form is adjusted to fit the grammatical and phonological rules of Spanish, and the Spanish lexicon has been extended for Texas dialects. The insertion of English words--still English in their syntactic and phonological use--is not borrowing, but rather inter-code switching, which is discussed in more detail, with many examples, in Paper V.

In addition to the ad hoc borrowings from English, there are many standard Spanish words that might appear off-hand to be borrowings, but are in fact indigenous Latinate words which are cognate to English words that were borrowed from either Latin or French. For instance, when the neighbor was talking, in Spanish, about her son in the Job Corps she wanted to say that he was studying welding and at first said "welding" but then, when asked specifically if she knew the Spanish word, said simply "está weldeando" and laughed at her own ("inadequate") language. Her friend supplied the word "soldar" (the standard Spanish word for both "weld" and "solder"), but since the author did not know for sure at the time what the standard word was, all three of us assumed for the moment that it too might be an ad hoc borrowing. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries in England similar linguistic vacillations surely were taking place as the English-speaking peasants and merchants tried to maintain their own language under imperceptible though real pressures from the dominant social groups who spoke another tongue, but the parallels should not be forced too far in the implicit comparison drawn here.

In directing the analysis of the second-and third-generation informants, the author added two categories that have not received much, if any, attention in the past: (1) language acquisition and development and (2) consideration of the Mexican-American's English primarily as a "dialect" of English rather than simply a second language that has not been fully internalized. Paper II deals specifically with these two categories. From his seven years of teaching in Texas high schools, as well as three years of teaching foreign students at the university level, he has seen that there are great differences between the linguistic behavior of the two groups and that these differences, along with a better means of analyzing "dialects with accents," must be more fully understood before bilingual programs can be entirely successful. The findings of this limited project, of course, are not intended to be regarded as more than those of an exploratory investigation using an implicit model of description with some refinements that the author has not seen in other studies.

The reasons for the addition of these two categories can be seen in the implications underlying some of the preceding discussion. Whatever accuracy is to be found in the claim that Mexican-Americans speak an inadequately internalized variety of English stems undoubtedly from the fact that few of them have progressed very far in school in the past; thus, rather early in their education they lost the opportunity for the well planned correction, practice, and refinement that is necessary to insure the acquisition of a "standardized" dialect--but this statement does not imply that they actually would have received the best of instruction anyway or that they would have agreed to dropping their family or peer-group language in favor of the shibboleth speech of language arts textbooks. As noted earlier, the nine-year-old boy has chosen to emulate his father's speech, which in its grammar is very much like the ("inadequately learned") English of bilingual students who drop out of school in the early grades. His siblings, on the other hand, have acquiesced in choosing school language over their father's. And these facts appear to reflect the complex process by which _any_ dialect of _any_ language is both perpetuated and changed. Similar observations can be made in regard to the retention and addition of so many English borrowings in Texas Spanish.

II. SOME COMMENTS ON THE ENGLISH OF EIGHT BILINGUALS

By Gail McBride Smith

Academic difficulties encountered by children from Spanish-speaking homes are often attributed to problems with English rather than trouble with the subject being taught. A study of the language of children from a Spanish-speaking home, therefore, might shed some light on these problems and enable teachers to deal with them more effectively. The English of the children interviewed for this project leads to conclusions quite different from the accepted ideas often purveyed in educational circles. All the children could communicate effectively in English, and none seemed to have any trouble understanding the English spoken to them. Very little of their non-standard English can be attributed to interference from Spanish; most of their mistakes are more reasonably traced to something that might be called arrested language development. The problems the parents encounter in speaking English are similar to those encountered by the children.

Many people assume, following logic that is easy to understand, that the errors made by bilinguals are caused by their mixing Spanish and English. One of the most important conclusions this writer draws from the research in this project is that interference from Spanish is not a major factor in the way bilinguals construct sentences and use the language. One comment, however, is essential to understanding some of the errors the children make: it is not possible to be certain that some of the mistakes that seem to come from Spanish interference are the result of the child's own knowledge of Spanish affecting his production of English because the parents of these children make the same mistakes. The children have picked up other expressions and usages from their parents, and it is quite possible that expressions that are traceable to Spanish interference are simply copied from what they hear their parents say. This is especially true in Judy's case because she speaks English at home and, in fact, can speak very little Spanish. Regardless of the source, there are few instances of such mistakes, but this note should be kept in mind throughout the reading of this paper.

The tape recordings of the interviews with the informants were transcribed and the mistakes classified according to type. The largest number of mistakes fell into a category best described as language development problems. These are problems that even native speakers encounter as they learn their language, and in the case of the children, the mistakes have remained in their language longer than they might in the language of a native speaker. The parents also suffer from this problem, but in their case it is probably caused by the fact that they left school very early. Many of the errors that are most noticeable are the sort that one might expect from elementary school children, for example, "You cooked it and he drinked it and he was still the same" (Lupe) and "My daddy he did some carpenter" (Sotero).

The next largest group of errors can be classified as regional dialect errors closely associated with social class. They are constructions used by native speakers of English who are of the working classes, and especially in the case of Sotero is this understandable because he works primarily with semi-skilled working class whites and Negroes. The children pick up this dialect from him and from their schoolmates. An instance of this is the use of got for have, which is common in the dialects of many working class people. Sotero uses it frequently ("I got two sisters there"), and Robert does the same thing ("They got two dogs").

The final classification to be discussed is the group of errors that are caused by Spanish interference. The size of this group is the major surprise of this project: few of the errors these children make are clearly traceable to Spanish, and even some of those that are are probably usages borrowed from their parents, particularly in Judy's case.

The errors in the language development category can be classified into four groups--morphology, syntax, vocabulary, and semantics. The morphology group contained the most difficult problem for the informants: verbs. Finding the proper verb form for their sentences was the source of the largest number of errors. Some of the errors were of the sort that monolingual English speakers make while they are learning the language. Sally said, "When he gots a ball in his mouth. . .," and Robert, "At Hemisfair a train it fall down in the water." Others are incorrectly formed tenses: "I wear Mexican dresses," for a past tense (Rachel), "And he kiss her," also a past tense (Robert), "He maked magic" (Robert), "He pulled the rope so the man could tripped" (Roy). Rachel had trouble with the verb to do in this passage, all of which is intended to be in the past tense: "And then we do it. We done it for the class. We done it to the parents." Another problem in the sentence is Spanish interference in the preposition, stemming from the Spanish para which can be translated either to or for. Even the present tense of some verbs caused trouble, as Sally's comment, "He jumpses on the sofa," and Robert's "Sometime he bark," indicate.

Syntax and vocabulary also caused problems. Failing to use certain auxiliary verbs was one feature of their speech; for example, "I bring the book if you want me to," (Sally) and "...and then it like a dough," (Rachel). Using a nonstandard word marked the informants as non-native speakers, but there was not always a clear indication that Spanish dictated the choice of the word that was used. Rachel said, "She went asleep," and Judy said, "They had a show of magic." The latter might be interpreted as interference (una presentación de la mágica) except for the fact that Judy does not speak much Spanish. Neither of these is precisely incorrect, but they are not the phrases native speakers would use. Robert misused the word say several times; for example, "If you say a good answer." The verb in Spanish for to say is decir and would be used in the Spanish equivalent of this sentence; he apparently does not know the English idiom "give an answer."

Prepositions are a vocabulary item that the children found quite difficult to deal with. Judy said, "He was going to throw it on somebody's face," and Rachel said, "She tried on the beds." Neither of these constructions is difficult to understand, and the source of their misunderstanding is easy to see: getting the right preposition in expressions like these is a matter of learning the right habit, not of using the word that makes sense. Why we say "on his head," but "in his face" is difficult to explain. One "tries on" a dress, so why not a bed? The native speaker knows the form is wrong, but explaining why it is wrong is difficult, as is the acquisition of idiomatic expressions such as these.

Another source of errors that is much easier to explain is the regional dialect that is heard so frequently in the community in which these informants live. Some of the things they learn are not standard English, but they are expressions and forms used by native speakers as well as bilinguals. "They was blue" (Judy), "They noticed she was laying down on the little baby bear's bed" (Rachel), "They got two dogs" (Robert), and "Them guys play a lot" (Roy) are examples of nonprestigious grammar that is common in this area among native speakers of English. Judy's mother uses was this way, too.

Apart from these occurrences of what might be called deviations from school-marm English grammar, these informants also used expressions common in the Negro dialects of Texas. "If it's a game...," meaning "If there's a game...," (Roy), "They were a lot of snakes" (Robert), "When we come, he be happy" (Robert), "And he come, he go after my father" (Robert), "They went to singing" (Rachel), and "Yesterday night" (Judy) are all part of the Negro dialect. The first two constructions are also widely used by whites in Bryan. The families have several Negro neighbors and Sotero and Judy's father work primarily with Negroes and working class whites--Sotero said there have seldom been any Latin Americans working with him. Robert has a strong tendency to use expressions from the working class dialect, and he no doubt copies a great many of them from his father, whom he clearly admires very much.

There was one phenomenon that is difficult to explain under any of these categories. All the children had a tendency to confuse masculine and feminine pronouns. "The man came and she was looking for the girl" (Robert), Sally repeatedly used "he" in speaking of her mother, and Rachel and Roy also used one when they ought to have used the other. In Spanish the pronoun is usually reflected in the verb ending in many verb phrases, which might lead an observer to believe that this is a sort of Spanish interference--since they usually do not use pronouns with verbs in Spanish, they use the wrong ones in English. However, this writer has observed the same practice on two occasions in native English-speaking children after the interviews brought this matter to her attention. Both the English-speaking children were younger than these children and in the first grade at school; this, therefore, may be a language development problem. It has taken longer for the Spanish-speaking children to master the pronouns.

There are, however, other problems that are clearly caused by Spanish interference. The double negative may or may not be one of these. Certainly Spanish uses the double negative frequently, but so do many native speakers of English. The children who speak Spanish at home do not use it frequently, but Judy does, as does her mother. Judy speaks English at home, and her speech is closer to working class native-speaker dialects than the other children's.

Most of the informants placed their adverbs and adjectives correctly, but Rachel had trouble with two sentences: "The father's chair was too way big," and "When my mother always goes to the grocery store she buys ham." In the first sentence Rachel indicates that she is not familiar with the idiom way too as a modifier of adjectives. She misplaces always in the second sentence, but she is probably trying to follow the English rule of placing always before the verb. Her problem, however, is that she has not mastered the English idioms whenever and always when, and here, in effect, has used the word in an unidiomatic way.

The verbs to make and to do caused some trouble, probably because hacer in Spanish can be translated both ways. Robert said, speaking of the dog, "He make like a ball right here," and Sally said, "Judy said to make a song." Both these usages indicate some confusion about the verb to make, although hacer would not be used in the second one. Another Spanish word with two translations that caused some confusion was ahí, which can be used for here or there under some circumstances. Roy had an especially strong tendency to confuse these two English words.

In and on, which are both translations of the Spanish en, were frequently used incorrectly. Roy said, "We heard it in the radio," and Robert said, "And then she knock in the door"--and he clearly meant on in this case rather than knocked it down. Rachel used at in place of in ("At the yard she has avocados"), but this again is related to the problem of translating en and a.

These few problems are the only ones that are clearly attributable to Spanish interference. These people are competent communicators in English. The problems they have with the language seem to stem from an incomplete mastery of the language that is similar to the monolingual native speaker's problems as he is learning it.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH OF FOUR SPANISH-SPEAKING FOREIGN STUDENTS

by Barbara Taylor Ward

The other investigators' papers deal directly with data elicited from native Texans who have provided rich examples of our major subject, the use of English and Spanish by bilinguals in Texas. In order to gain a better perspective, in general terms, of the linguistic ability of people who know and use different languages on a daily basis, this paper will present for a basis of comparison and contrast, a discussion of some of the grammatical, syntactic, and morphological errors in the English of native Spanish speakers who have only recently learned English as a second language. The degree to which these errors in English may be the result of interference from Spanish will be especially noted.

The four informants selected for this study are all citizens of the Dominican Republic who are presently undergraduates at Texas A&M University. The educations of these young men are co-sponsored by their government and A.I.D., Agency for International Development, an agency of the U. S. Department of State. Ruperto has been studying here the longest time, having arrived in the summer of 1966. Carlos, Blas, and Tomás came only a year ago to begin the summer-long intensive English course which has been provided at Texas A&M for each new group of Dominican students. Since I was one of the daily instructors of the course last summer, I have had ample opportunity to know and evaluate the abilities of Carlos, Blas, and Tomás. Ruperto's progress as an English speaker is also quite well-known to me as I met him socially soon after his arrival here three years ago and have maintained a friendship with him ever since. I know personally that all four have one rather important linguistic factor in common; none of them could speak any English prior to their arrival in Texas.

My procedures for analyzing the Dominican students' English for this report are an attempt to present the data in a straight-forward manner in keeping with the exploratory purposes of the overall project. I recorded on tape thirty-minute interviews in English with Carlos and Blas separately. I also recorded a fifteen-minute interview with Tomás and Ruperto together. All the interviews were conducted very informally in order to elicit the informants' usual manner and proficiency in English. During the interviews the Dominicans felt free of any strain which might inhibit their speaking naturally, such as a notion that they were perhaps being "tested for errors." Rather, I simply explained to them beforehand that, for a special project, I would like to have some interesting samples on tape of Dominicans speaking English, which is of course quite true. Accurate typescripts were made from the tapes in order that each error could be identified and indexed.

Another procedure I have followed is to use for my analysis the same classification of errors devised by Gustavo González in his unpublished preliminary study of the English of Spanish-speaking migrant children in South Texas who were interviewed near the end of their first year of elementary school. Using the González classifications provides a valid basis for contrasting the English of two groups who are still in the process of learning it--Dominicans with no English background and Texas migrant children who have, presumably, always had some access to an English-speaking culture, if only through association with bilingual parents. It has been necessary to change slightly some of the wording in the González classifications, but more significantly, it has also been necessary to add several kinds of errors which the migrant children did not make. By the same token, many of their errors were not repeated at all in the Dominicans' English. Hence, many informal distinctions can be seen although there are some general points of comparison which can also be made concerning the coincidence of some errors made by both groups, as shown on Table A. Whether or not such coincidences involve interference from Spanish will of course be of special interest. When Spanish interference occurs in one group but not in the other, the difference in ages between the two groups should be kept in mind, since age is a strong factor in an individual's language development, whether in learning the grammar of his dominant, or native, language or whether in mastering a second language.

The taped conversation with Carlos provides the largest number and the widest variety of English errors for this analysis, a result which I had expected. At 29, he is several years older than the other Dominicans who arrived in his group last summer. It is customary for these groups to have one older member who serves as an unofficial spokesman for and advisor to the younger Dominicans, and Carlos fills this role. He is quite intelligent and eager to learn, but I have often thought that his feeling of authority, combined with his being older, somewhat interfered with his learning of English since in the classroom he often seemed much less flexible than the younger Dominicans.

In our intensive English course last summer, the group was divided into two sections; Group A was the advanced class whose members learned rapidly and could profit from an enriched program, whereas Group B contained the Dominicans who found learning English to be quite a struggle and who needed painstaking drills and individual instruction. Blas and Tomás worked in Group A, while Carlos labored in Group B, making steady progress, but, like a few others, with difficulty. At the end of the course his score on the TOEFL examination (Test of English as a Foreign Language) just barely qualified him for enrollment in Texas A&M University. So it is not surprising that a year later Carlos' competence in English is not equal to that of Blas or Tomás, both of whom did well on the TOEFL test.

It is important to remember that a year later these foreign students are still in the process of learning English although not at the same rate as at first, which is also true of course for migrant children in South Texas. Carlos is still far behind Blas in English proficiency, which is quite evident in their taped interviews with me, both for thirty minutes of conversation on the same general topics. Blas made 49 identifiable errors, whereas Carlos made more than twice as many, with 110 in fewer sentences because he speaks more slowly than Blas. In relation to the tabulations of Gustavo González, Carlos' performance in English assumes another interesting perspective. From the English of 26 migrant children, González identified 56 different kinds of errors, but Carlos made only 10 of those kinds of mistakes. And in those ten categories less than half of the children had errors in them, except for the extremely limited one designated use of plural verb in place of third person singular with pronoun subject (González); example:

(1) The things that he tell me to take him I take him (González).

Twenty-two of the migrant children made that verb error, thus establishing it as highly common. Yet Carlos only made that mistake once, although Blas, a faster speaker, did make it five times.

(2) Carl: He play with San Francisco team.
(3) Blas: It look like my country.
(4) Blas: He say some idiom.

Since Carlos and Blas made only two other types of subject-verb agreement errors, making a total of 7 errors for Blas and only 3 for Carlos, it is quite evident that verbs do not present as great a difficulty for a foreign student learning

English as they do for children in a bilingual family. It is important to note that these verb errors are not representative of Spanish interference so much as they are the effects encountered in general verb mastery problems inherent in language learning. I have heard errors like those in (2) - (4) in the speech of children learning English in an Anglo environment in which no other language is spoken. Sentences like *Mommy say no* for *Mommy says no* have often been made by my own children when they were quite young. Thus the high incidence of such errors in the English of the migrant children should not be attributed simply to their dominant knowledge of Spanish.

Even more disparity appears in the fact that Carlos and the other Dominicans made many kinds of errors that the 26 migrant children never made. It was necessary to add 31 different kinds of mistakes to the 56 in the González classifications in order to account for all the Dominicans' errors. Carlos alone made mistakes that required 19 additions to the González list. That learning English *does* not present the same problems for all Spanish speakers, irrespective of cultural background, is quite clearly seen in the case of several of the major grammatical categories in the González classifications. For example, under the major category *Possessive Adjectives*, there are 10 kinds of errors listed, but a sole Dominican, Carlos, made only one error in just one of those 10 kinds: *use of subject pronoun in place of possessive*.

(5) CARL: Oh, during . . . *we* stay in San Antonio City we
visit[ed]. . . uh . . . Hil . . . Hilton Hotel.

The highest incidence of errors among the migrant children occurred in three of those ten sub-categories; the Dominicans, on the other hand, made no errors in any of the three, which are:

(6) *use of the definite article THE in place of an adjective* -
example: They're brush *the* hair (González).

(7) use of singular possessive for plural possessive -
example: Q. What are they doing?
A. Washing his [their] teeth (González).

(8) irregular formation of possessive -
example: One is of a father and another pair is of a boy (González).

The category in which Carlos scored the largest number of his errors is one in which only one of the migrant children erred. Carlos has a startling total of 31 errors in count nouns treated as mass nouns (González), with 66 percent more errors than in the next highest category. In the corresponding category of mass nouns treated as count nouns (González), Carlos also made 6 errors, making these two noun problems the source of the majority of all his errors. Thus, of the 29 different kinds of errors that he made, 33 percent of them were caused by his failure to use certain determiners whose occurrence is obligatory in English with certain kinds of nouns. This failure is illustrated by the following sentences produced by Carlos.

(9) It is () beautiful city.
(10) This is () beautiful city.
(11) Alamo place is () very interesting place.
(12) I . . . will be () graduate student . . . .
(13) Dominican student are () big group.
(14) There are () big group from Dominican Republic . . . .
(15) He's () big pitcher in United States.
(16) Marichal is () big leaguer . . . .
(17) But I think the laboratory is very interesting because . . . we have () opportunity to take very good pronunciation in English.

Aside from any other kinds of errors, all of the above examples of Spanish interference are caused by a lack of complete syntactic correspondence between the uses of the English indefinite article a and the Spanish un in noun phrase constructions. This particular interference and other related problems are described by Robert P. Stockwell, et al., in The Grammatical

Structures of English and Spanish (Chicago, 1965), pp. 68-87. In fact, he identifies the conflict between *a* and Ø--a symbol he uses to indicate that no article should be used with the noun--as one of the two kinds of mistakes which "lead to the largest number of student errors resulting from structural pressures," and he further states that "this contrast occurs most frequently after a linking verb when the following noun shows mere identification . . ." (p. 68). Although all nine of the above examples from Carlos illustrate Stockwell's conclusion, it may seem questionable that this error must result from Spanish syntactic interference since, according to Stockwell (p. 69):

> . . . Spanish sentences . . . can take an indefinite article before the predicate noun, but then the meaning undergoes a subtle change. Instead of mere identification, the predicate then serves to individualize. The English equivalent of the Spanish contrast with and without an article after *ser* is usually a matter of emphasis.
>
> *He's a doctor. Es médico. [mere identification]
>
> He's a *doctor*. Es un médico. [individualization]
>
> *All unnumbered example sentences listed under quotations in this paper are from Stockwell.

In (9) - (17) Carlos seems to be merely identifying, rather than individualizing, thus suggesting that the cause of his errors may be more semantic than syntactic. Certainly adjectives such as *big* and *beautiful* do not strongly differentiate for specific, individual meaning for the nouns *city* or *group*. Although the modifier *graduate* in (12) is more specific, local campus usage implies a compound noun relationship in the words *graduate student*, a designation which, again, merely identifies. The presence of modifiers in all of the noun phrases in (9) - (17) raises another question as to whether or not their lack of an article is in fact an interference of Spanish syntax, since Stockwell (p. 69) quickly points out that

> . . . modification, especially by an enhancing adjective, is usually individualizing and usually requires the article.
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | He's a good doctor. | Es un buen médico. |
> | He's a ferocious tyrant. | Es un tirano feroz. |
>
> But modification in and of itself is not a determining factor. Occasionally a modified noun is used without an indefinite article, which then shows mere identification.
>
> Tú que eres hombre respetable . . .

It is the last example above, lacking an indefinite article, which corresponds to the meaning implied in (9) - (17). I would also suggest that perhaps the Spanish adjective classification and syntactic position, as illustrated in that last example, may also tend to eliminate the indefinite article in a Spanish speaker's English sentence. In the example *Es un tirano feroz* the adjective *feroz* would never occur in the environment DET + ADJ + N, as *buen* does in the example *Es un buen médico* and as in the English sentence *He's a ferocious tyrant*. In addition to the influence of the intention to merely identify something, perhaps the articles are deleted in (9) - (17) because the adjectives, which are so artificially placed according to the Spanish syntax, are in part replacing the articles, if the speaker is thinking in Spanish. If *feroz* preceded a noun in Spanish, it would indicate the singular meaning provided by *un*, which can be followed by only a very few Spanish adjectives as exceptions to the most regular syntactic pattern.

If the Spanish speaker is violating that pattern, in order to produce an ADJ + N Pattern for an English sentence, he very well may simplify his task erroneously by dropping the article in accord with the English *plural* structure in which the article is not used, as in *They're lawyers* and *They're very good lawyers* (Stockwell, p. 69). This structuring would of course correspond to *Es médico* and would again match the intended meaning of mere identification. This explanation may be another way to account for Carlos' construction in (9) - (17). For example, for (10), *This is () beautiful city*, Spanish syntax would exert strong pressure on the speaker to produce *Esta es una ciudad hermosa* into the direct translation *This is a city beautiful*. Here the major effort is to produce the correct *order* in a noun phrase rather than to decide whether or not to use the article as a determiner in that phrase. The Spanish speaker may easily assume that the article is optional since in many cases it does not appear before English nouns, as in *They're lawyers*, *Biology is interesting*, etc. As a result he may drop *a* in *This is () beautiful city* in correspondence to the Spanish sentence *Esta es nieve hermosa* in which no article is required before the mass noun *nieve*. He perhaps attempts unfortunately to simplify the phrase, as well as his problem in syntax, by reducing the number of the words in the phrase in order to concentrate on achieving the correct English pattern ADJ + N rather than the Spanish N + ADJ. Evidently Carlos has not mastered the completely obligatory English rule that an indefinite singular count noun must be preceded by *a*. The following examples will illustrate his failure to apply this rule in other syntactic patterns besides the pattern illustrated throughout (9) - (17): *to be* + *a* + *ADJ* + N.

(18) We have () baby girl.
(19) They have () beautiful show.
(20) () Dominican party [is] very happy.
(21) We went . . . to () beautiful night club.
(22) I am () Aggie. [An *Aggie* is a student at Texas A&M.]

In addition to his problems with the indefinite *a*, Carlos also has many errors in constructions in which English Ø corresponds to Spanish *el*, an interference in translation which Stockwell considers the other major cause of "student errors resulting from structural pressures." He emphasizes, "This difference generates a considerable number of errors. One of the most common is the use of nouns referring to all of something--that is, referring to something in very general terms" (p. 70). The following sentences produced by Carlos exemplify Stockwell's contention because life and baseball are general, abstract nouns.

(23) I think the life for married student is more happy . . . (Creo que la vida para los estudiantes casados es más feliz.)

(24) My favorite sport is the baseball. (Mi deporte favorito es el béisbol.)

On the other hand, Carlos also produced many sentences in which he omitted an obligatory the.

(25) () Biology course is very hard. [referring to one of the courses he was taking at the time]

(26) Alou plays with () Atlanta team.

(27) In () training center is the special program . . . . [referring to a specific training center in the Dominican Republic]

(28) I think the travel [moon trip] is very interesting for all () world.

(29) We repeat[ed] all () sentences for very good pronunciation. [referring to a particular lesson]

Although there are "structural pressures" to be accounted for, the errors in (23) - (20) also seem to result from a Spanish speaker's confusion about mass noun usage in English. There are other possible explanations for the errors in (26) - (28) since the use of Biology, Atlanta, or training as nouns would not be preceded by an article. Because he has used modifiers, Carlos has missed the realization that course, team, and center are specific noun designations that require articles, whereas Biology, Atlanta, and training do not, either because they are proper nouns and/or mass nouns. But the errors in (26) - (29) suggest another related complication in a construction in which the omitted definite article causes an inappropriate suppression of the final -s of a noun, as in the following sentences produced by Carlos.

(30) Dominican student are big group.

(31) They are brother.

(32) There are several married student here.

(33) Some teacher has . . . clear pronunciation . . .
[context requires the plural form teachers]

(34) When I went to Houston, I visit[ed] the Astrodome and some night club.

(35) And sometime we celebrate especial party.

The lack of pluralization in (30) - (35) may indicate that Carlos assumes a gross semantic distinction between the singular and plural forms of English mass nouns. In using the singular form erroneously, he may be unconsciously attempting to preserve the exact meaning of the noun in case it is a mass noun, since in Spanish changing a mass noun into a count noun by pluralization can shift the meaning considerably. As Stockwell illustrates, "Carne refers to meat, but carnes more likely refers to the abundant flesh of an overweight person" (p. 86). Thus there are at least two possible pressures on the Spanish speaker to use simple English mass noun-construction: (1) to preserve the exact meaning the mass noun would have in Spanish, and (2) to relieve himself of the need to select appropriate articles or plural endings.

None of the migrant children in the Gonzâlez study made errors like those in (30) - (35), so it was necessary for me to add the category incorrect use of singular noun in order to account for such mistakes in the Dominicans' sentences. Initially I had no notion that their incorrect singular constructions might be related to mass noun or count noun interference from Spanish or I would have included them in those specific categories. Carlos had a total of 11 errors in incorrect singular usage, which, when added to those he made in the mass noun and count noun categories, make a total of 48 errors which can be traced to this kind of Spanish influence in his English--or a total of almost 44 percent of his total mistakes in thirty minutes of conversation. The main purposes of this discussion of these particular errors by Carlos have been threefold:

a. to establish the massive effect of Spanish interference in a foreign student's production of English that contains many errors;

b. to suggest some of the complications of that interference by analyzing some of the most interesting problems arising from Carlos' sentences;

c. to emphasize that the learning problems in English are not the same for all Spanish speakers, that the learning process is also individually influenced by major factors other than Spanish interference, such as personal ability, early cultural background, whether or not that background might be bilingual in any degree, and--perhaps above all--by differences in age levels.

Point number three is supported by the fact that, in the three categories in which Carlos made 44 percent of his errors, none of the 26 migrant children made an error in one of them, only five children made errors in another, and just one child made mistakes in the third. Their lack of the kind of errors which appear so extensively in Carlos' production of English indicates that their degree of competence in Spanish, determined in large part by their age level, does not significantly damage their competence in English in at least one major area of demonstrated Spanish interference. Thus whatever Spanish interference does occur in their English must be thought of as a limited number of specific kinds of interferences rather than as a rampant susceptibility to the full gamut of conflicts between the two languages. This idea refutes the premises which form the basis for the blanket condemnation of their Spanish, a condemnation which is often made in misguided "school grammar" attempts to suppress all a child's Spanish in the belief that it interferes with all his attempts to learn English.

My survey of Carlos' mistakes shows that 67 percent of all of them are probably the result of Spanish interference, as indicated by the categories listed in Table C. The incidence of such errors in the interview with Tomás was 48 percent, while in Blas' interview it fell to 33 percent. This rather wide disparity in the amount of Spanish interference in the English of Dominicans, who have all been studying and using English the same length of time, casts some doubt on the validity of Spanish interference as an easy scapegoat for most of the mistakes of bilingual speakers, either native Americans or not. Ruperto, who has been at Texas A&M two years longer than the other three Dominicans, has cut his incidence of Spanish interference to only 10 percent. Surely individual learning ability and effort must be important factors, as well as the possibility that substandard English dialect constructions (e.g., you was, it don't, I seen him) may be learned through social intercourse in the community--an eventuality which is hardly avoidable in the lives of migrant children in Texas.

One fallacy concerning the tenacity of Spanish interference in English sentence structure concerns the belief that the double negative in Spanish accounts for its frequent appearance in English in the speech of a bilingual. Yet Blas and Ruperto did not use any double negatives at all, while Carlos and Tomás each produced only one. Even more interesting is the absence in the González list of any double negative errors in the English of the migrant children. These indications suggest that the interference of the Spanish double negative is easily suppressed, and, therefore, if the double negative does appear in the speech of bilinguals, perhaps it is one instance in which substandard English dialect is the damaging influence rather than the speaker's Spanish grammar. It is interesting to note that the children interviewed by González had not yet "mastered" the substandard dialect use of double negative in English.

I would like to suggest as a constructive conclusion that further study of Spanish interference in the English of Mexican-Americans might be most fruitful if concentrated in the first two categories listed in Table A. Those kinds of errors are the ones in which Carlos and the other Dominicans have found it quite difficult to overcome the contrasts between English and Spanish; they are also the kinds of mistakes that a significant number of the migrant children made, with the largest number of children producing errors in the category omission of subject pronoun (González). This latter kind of error may seem so common that it would appear obvious that a Spanish speaker "can't help" making this error. Yet Blas and Tomás had only a negligible amount of such difficulty with only one and two errors respectively. And Ruperto did not make this error at all, offering further evidence that if improvement in English is being strived for, this kind of error can be eliminated. However, it may be pedagogically most profitable and efficient to develop first a better understanding of the ways in which Spanish interference is most pervasively producing the same kinds of errors in the English of diverse kinds of Spanish speakers.

TABLE A

Selected Coincidences of English Errors

The types of errors listed below are those in which there is significant coincidence in the English errors of both the Mexican-American migrant children and the foreign students from the Dominican Republic. The second category, marked Migrants, refers to the number of migrant children who made those types of errors in the González study. The last four categories show the number of errors of those same kinds made by Dominicans Carlos, Blas, Tomás, and Ruperto in their taped interviews for this study.

Types of Errors	Migrants	C	B	T	R
omission of subject pronoun	11	6	1	2	0
mass noun treated as count noun	5	6	0	0	1
use of plural verb in place of 3rd person singular	22	1	5	0	0
use of present tense in place of past tense	8	12	1	1	0

TABLE B

General Comparison of the Incidence of Errors in English by Spanish Speakers

In the first column below is a selected list of significant categories of English errors in which the rates of incidence are either relatively high or low. All the listed categories, with the exception of number 3, are from the 56 categories identified by Gustavo González in his study of first grade migrant children. Category 3 identifies one of the 31 types of errors the four Dominican informants made which were not discovered in the González study.

Categories 1-5 are arranged together for the purpose of (a) stressing the most numerous kinds of English errors made by the Dominican who made the most errors, and (b) indicating a close semantic relationship of categories 1-3. Categories 6-17 are arranged in descending order according to the rate of incidence of the errors made by the children.

Types of Errors	No. of Migrant Children Making These Errors	Approx. Percentage of These Errors in Carlos' English
1. mass noun treated as count noun	5	5
2. count noun treated as mass noun	1	28
3. incorrect use of singular noun	0	10
4. present tense instead of past tense	1	11
5. omission of subject pronoun	8	5

6. use of plural verb in place of 3rd person singular	22	1
7. omission of possessive where required	16	0
8. use of *card* for *letter*	14	0
9. use of *see* for *look at*	12	0
10. omission of subject pronoun (same as #5 above)	11	5
11. use of the definite article *the* instead of an adjective	11	0
12. use of singular pronoun with plural antecedent	10	0
13. use of *he* in place of *she*	10	1
14. use of singular possessive for plural possessive	9	0
15. use of *in* in place of *on*	9	0
16. use of *putting* instead of *putting on*	9	0
17. omission of *to be* from the present progressive tense	8	0

TABLE C

English Errors by Dominicans

SUMMARY:	Carlos	Blas	Tomás	Ruperto
Total No. Errors	110	49	25	19
Types of Errors	29	23	14	12

INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE: Carlos

(Asterisks below precede error categories from Gonzálaz.)

	1. omission of verb	2
*	2. present tense instead of past tense	12
*	3. omission of linking verb	1
	4 incorrect demonstrative pronoun	2
*	5. omission of subject pronoun	6
*	6. incorrect semantic meaning in pronoun	1
*	7. plural verb with 3rd person singular	1
*	8. plural verb with singular subject	2
*	9. subject pronoun in place of possessive	1
	10. double negative	1
	11. incorrect use of singular noun	11
	12. incorrect use of adjective suffix	1
	13. omission of suffix	2
	14. incorrect comparative forms	3
	15. irregular position of adverb phrase	3
	16. irregular object construction	1
	17. irregular position of subject	1
*	18. mass noun treated as count noun	6
*	19. count noun treated as mass noun	31
	20. incorrect preposition	2
	21. omission of preposition	6
	22 omission of to from infinitive	3
	23. unnecessary use of and	1

24. extra word for designating a place	5
*25. omission of direct object	2
26. incorrect semantic selection	7
27. incorrect use of another	3
28. omission of necessary words	2
*29. use of Spanish word	1

INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE: Blas

1. omission of verb	3
2. use of present tense for future meaning	1
* 3. present tense for past tense	1
* 4. omission of linking verb	2
5. subject pronoun in place of object pronoun	1
6. use of they for there	1
* 7. omission of subject pronoun	1
8. singular verb with 1st person pronoun subj.	1
* 9. plural verb with 3rd person pronoun subject	5
*10. singular verb with plural subject	1
*11. plural verb with singular subject	1
*12. use of no instead of not to negate	1
*13. use of no instead of do+not+verb	2
14. incorrect use of singular noun	10
15. incorrect addition of s to a pronoun	2
16. irregular complement	1
17. use of an before a consonant	1
*18. count noun treated as mass noun	1
19. incorrect preposition	2
20. omission of preposition	2
*21. redundant use of pronouns	3
*22. omission of direct object	1
23. incorrect semantic selection	5

INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE: Tomás

* 1. use of progressive tense instead of present perfect tense	1
* 2. present tense instead of past tense	1
* 3. omission of pronoun subject	2

* 4. incorrect semantic meaning in pronoun	1
5. double negative	1
* 6. use of no instead of not to negate	1
7. incorrect use of singular noun	6
8. incorrect addition of s to a pronoun	1
* 9. incorrect plural formation	1
10. incorrect preposition	1
11. incorrect semantic selection	6

INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE: Ruperto

1. use of had for past tense for did	1
2. incorrect present perfect	1
3. present participle in place of past part.	1
* 4. omission of to be from present progr. tense	1
5. use of it for there	1
* 6. plural verb with singular subject	1
7. incorrect singular	1
8. omission of suffix	1
* 9. mass nouns treated as count nouns	1
10. unnecessary use of the	1
11. unnecessary relative pronoun	1
12. incorrect semantic selection	8

IV. DIALECTAL AND NONSTANDARD FORMS IN TEXAS SPANISH

by Donald M. Lance

The most interesting point to be made about the Spanish of the informants in this project is that they used very few forms that are not also used in other parts of the Spanish-speaking world. Many of the "deviant" forms are actually archaic forms that also occur in other areas of the world, and some of the pronunciation features reflect phonological trends found elsewhere in American Spanish. The only feature that might represent a linguistic change unique to Texas Spanish is a seeming confusion of the forms for the imperfect tense, the conditional, and the past subjunctive forms of certain verbs. The children and Consuelo--who, as explained earlier, spoke only English between the ages of about eight and about eighteen--were the only ones who displayed an appreciable amount of English interference in their Spanish. Many of the children's "errors," like their "errors" in English as described in Paper II, seem to be largely developmental. On the whole, no justification was found for the common belief--held particularly by monolingual Anglos, but also by many Mexican-Americans--that Texas Spanish is impoverished in its vocabulary and grammar and is generally "corrupt." A more relativistic, less dogmatic, and undoubtedly more useful description of their language is that it is very much like that of other people who have not received the amount and kind of education required to instruct the children of the speech community in the proper use of the King's or Academy's language. Analogous comments might be made about rural Yorkshire versus Oxbridge, Appalachian versus Princetonian, or Andalucian peasant versus Castillian Academy speech, though no true parallels can ever be drawn in language behavior because the history, sociology, and cultural psychology of each section of any country is inevitably different.

In this paper four general areas will be discussed: general pronunciation features, verb forms, regional vocabulary, and interference from English. In order to compare the Spanish of the informants with the Spanish of the rest of the world, it is necessary to make references to earlier studies of a more comprehensive nature. The following books were used:

Cerda, Gilberto, Berta Cabaza, and Julieta Farias. *Vocabulario español de Tejas.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1953.

González, Gustavo. "A Linguistic Profile of the Spanish-Speaking First-Grader in Corpus Christi." Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Texas at Austin, August, 1968.

Lapesa, Rafael. *Historia de la lengua española*, sixth edition. Madrid: Escelicer, S. A., 1965.

Menéndez Pidal, R. *Manual de gramática histórica española*, eleventh edition. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, S. A., 1962.

Real Academia Española. *Diccionario manual e ilustrado de la lengua española*, second edition. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, S. A., 1950.

Santamaría, Francisco J. *Diccionario de mejicanismos.* Méjico: Editorial Porrúa, S. A., 1959.

An observation that Anglos often make about Texas Spanish is that is is spoken very fast, all run together. Lapesa, in a comment on the influences of Indian lingustic substrata on American Spanish, makes a similar statement about Mexican Spanish in general:

> Cabe admitir influjos de igual origen, primitivos o no, en el ritmo del hablar, que altera la regular duración de las sílabas: el mejicano abrevia nerviosamente las no acentuadas . . . , mientras el argentino se detiene con morosidad antes del acento y en la sílaba que lo lleva, y el cubano se mueve con perezosa lentitud. (p. 346)

Some of his wording might raise American eyebrows, and the Cuban Spanish I have heard is hardly *lento*, but the comment on the Mexicans' suppressing unaccented syllables is easily documented by citing just a few of the many examples recorded in our interviews: '*toy*, '*stá*, '*tá*, '*taba*, '*tuve* (forms of *estar*), '*cer* (*hacer*), *vo*' (*voy*), *mu*' (*muy*), *só* (*sólo*), *l'igo* (*le digo*), *v'ese* (*ve ese*), *l' edad* (*la edad*), *es'* *otras* (*esas otras*), *qu' él* (*que él*), *pa'l* (*para el*), *pa' 'rriba* (*para arriba*), *pa' 'llá* (*para allá*), *pa' 'cá* (*para acá*), *pa' que* (*para que*), *pa' 'fuera* (*para afuera*). As well, a single consonant may be lost: *colora'o* (*colorado*), *que'an* (*quedan*), *a'eces* (*a veces*), *me 'ijé* (*me fijé*). Sometimes the syllable lost is a medial one that ordinarily carries word stress but is lost because it is in an unstressed position in the sentence: *l'o* (*luego*), *pa'ce* (*parece*), *tra'a* (*trabaja*). The initial syllable of a few words was always suppressed in the interviews: '*prender* (*aprender* in all its forms), '*horita* (*ahorita*). Certain other words were sometimes contracted and sometimes not: '*hora* - *ahora*, '*apá* - *papá*, '*amá*, *pa*' - *para*. The children, quite understandably, had many more contractions that the adults, such as '*pués* and even '*pos* for *después*, '*roplano*, '*vidó* (*olvidó*), *mu'chito* (*muchachito*), '*rina* (*harina*), *se 'costó* (*se acostó*), *l' nijita* (*la necesita*).

These contractions have not only the effect of increasing the rate of production of phrases but also the side effect of complicating the phonological rules related to synalepha. For example, in *a'eces* the *a* and *e* formed a diphthong, with *a* being the stronger vowel. Similarly, if *vo*' were to occur before *a hacer*, the effect would be [βwasɛr], from which the non-native might find it difficult to reconstruct *voy a hacer* when it occurs in a very weakly stressed part of the sentence. As I was transcribing the tapes for typescripts, I often encountered such difficulties, but after Carmen had corrected my transcriptions, usually with little difficulty, I was very often surprised that I had not been able to reconstruct some of the underlying forms,which then appeared to be quite clear. In this same regard, I have heard foreign students from the Dominican Republic make statements to the effect that they had to get used to the pronunciation of Bryan Spanish or Argentinan Spanish before they could understand all the words; similarly, students from Mexico make similar observations about Dominican Spanish.

A number of other features of the speech of these informants reflect diachronic phonological developments that are common in both American and Andalucían Spanish. Perhaps the most widespread is that in certain environments an /s/ becomes somewhat like the English /h/. Lapesa (pp. 348-349) observes that in eastern Andalucía, Murcia, Puerto Rico, and Uruguay the -s of plural nouns and second person singular verbs is realized not as an aspirated segment but simply as a lengthening and lowering of the preceding vowel. He comments (p. 354) that the final [s] is retained in the plains of México, some Andean regions of Colombia and Ecuador, and almost all of Perú and Bolivia. The final [h] has developed through time in Estremadura, La Mancha, Andalucía, Murcia, New Mexico, and Colombia, and among the lower classes in Chile and other countries. He stresses (p. 350) that these phenomena did not descend from the pre-colonial dialects of southern Spain but rather are parallel diachronic developments. I have heard these pronunciations in the Spanish of many foreign students from all parts of Latin America, most noticeably in those from the Caribbean, Central America, and the northern coast of South America. In the present study I found that all but the two youngest informants also produced the [h] variant of /s/ occasionally, the grandparents doing so many times, in such words as esa, necesita, nosotros, pos, hicimos, parece, más, dicen, sí, clase, es, misma, tres, español. These words were not always pronounced with [h] by these speakers, whereas that pronunciation is the general rule in other dialects. When this pronunciation in medial position is written in eye dialect it is nojotros, hijimos, nejesita, etc., though the pronunciation is clearly not [x], the usual pronunciation of j. Thus, this feature of Texas Spanish cannot be interpreted as a "corruption" that is unique to the area.

Another interesting pronunciation is the use of [x] instead of [f], as in juerza (fuerza), ajuera, and the preterit and past subjunctive forms of *ir* and *ser* (*jui*, *juites*, *juimos*, *juera*, etc.). Lupe and her father-in-law usually pronounced these words with [x] but occasionally used [f]; the others always used [x], though there were not enough examples to establish clearly that this pronunciation would always be used. Lapesa (p. 362) lists *juerza* among the "vulgarismos" that are still used in the common and rustic speech of Spain but are used more extensively in America. Cerda cites occurrences of the preterit forms with [x] in Yucatán, Hidalgo, and New Mexico. I have heard them in other parts of Texas, as has Carmen. (On one occasion Rachel produced the hyper-form *frifoles*, from *frijoles*.)

The children produced some phoneme substitutions that appear to be "baby talk" but also reflect a phonological phenomenon that has been observed in Spain and throughout America: '*güelita* (*abuelita*), *güeno* (*bueno*). Lapesa (pp. 300-301) attributes this shift of [β] to [ɣ] to a tendency for "el hablar vulgar" of Castilla to retract the point of articulation for voiced consonants. Rachel produced the reverse shift in *juevar* (*jugar*). Menéndez Pidal (pp. 194-195) suggests that the explanation may be an "error de audición" because of acoustic similarity. As it relates to child language, the latter interpretation seems better. Both Roy and Rachel also substituted [ɾ] for [ð] in *adentro* (*arentro*), which also appear to be acoustically similar in that environment.

Two interesting metatheses occurred. Sally said *hevrido* for *hervido* and Roy said *quería* for *creía*. This phenomenon, like the one above, should be of interest in studies of children's Spanish.

Lapesa points out (p. 356) that some features of American Spanish are not Andalucian but rather were either imported from northern Spain or have independently evolved in a parallel manner in both places, such as, respectively, the introduction of "vulgarisms" such as *maiz* (instead of *maíz*) and *pior* (instead of *peor*) and the loss of -*ll*- in words such as *gallina*, *amarillo*, and *botella*. He cites their occurrence in Rioja, Navarra, Vizcaya, Arragón, and Castilla in Spain and in New Mexico, northern México, Guatemala, and the coasts of Ecuador and Perú. Consuelo produced *pior* (the only occurrence of the word in the interviews) and always used *maiz*. Lupe and her father-in-law used both *maiz* and *maís*, but no reason for the alternation was apparent. Examples of the loss of -*ll*- abound in Texas: *ea* (*ella*), *semía* (*semilla*), *bolío* (*bolillo*), *aí* (*allí*), *tortía* (*tortilla*). Cerda lists *maiz* as a common form in Texas, México, and New Mexico. Menéndez Pidal (p. 39) lists *ahi* alongside *maiz*, attributing them to "la preferencia del habla vulgar por el diptongo," and cites its occurrence in Vizcaya and Bogotá. Cerda lists *ahi* as occurring in Argentina as well as in Texas. All of the informants in this group showed a marked preference for *ahi*. Lupe and Lidia also said *ahí* on several occasions, but since the -*ll*- is consistently lost or weakened in their speech, they may actually have been saying *allí*, though the context did not clarify which was most appropriate to the meaning.

Another rather noticeable feature of Texas Spanish is the incidence of nonstandard verb forms. As with some of the pronunciation features, many are dialectal items that date directly or indirectly back to early developments in Spanish as it evolved from Latin. There is some vacillation, for instance, in the placement of stress on the first person plural forms of the imperfect indicative (Lupe: *ibamos*, *llevabamos*; David: *trabajábanos* with the dissimilation /m/ →/n/), past subjunctive (Cons: *hiciéramos*; David: *trabajaramos*), and present subjunctive. Menéndez Pidal (pp. 276, 300) points out that in Latin the -*a*- of -*amus* and -*atis* was long but that, as Spanish developed, the stress was retracted on the first and second persons plural of the imperfect indicative and the past subjunctive (amābāmus→amábamos, amaverāmus→amáramos; erātis→érais, fuerātis→fuérais); and in the first and second persons plural of the present subjunctive the stress was also retracted in Andalucía and a large part of America (*véamos*, *véais*; *váyamos*, *váyais*). The second person plural forms are not used in Texas. González notes (p. 63) that -*mos* often changes to -*nos* when the stress is placed on the antepenultimate syllable. Only two first person plural present subjunctive verbs occurred in the interviews, both spoken by Lupe (*llevemos*, *queramos*) and both with standard stress placement; however, I have heard the nonstandard form many times in Texas, as has Carmen. Not enough examples of these forms were recorded to establish a clear pattern for these speakers, though the alternations in the few examples given above suggest that the explanation cannot be a simple one. Lapesa (p. 302) also associates the retraction of the accent on the present subjunctive forms with the existence of -*ábamos*, -*áramos*, etc. and says that it was used in the nineteenth century by such literary figures as Espronceda, Hartzenbusch, and Castelar and even appeared in a grammar book, but he adds that at present it persists only "como vulgarismo en varias regiones españoles y, con gran difusión, en América." Cerda comments that *háigamos* is used in Texas, Guanajuato, and Durango.

Other nonstandard verb forms found in this study go back to earlier patterns (Cons: *semos* for *somos*; Rach: *salemos* for *salimos*; Sotero, Lupe, and Lidia: *haiga* for *haya*). Lapesa (p. 302) lists *semos* and *haiga* among analogue forms that date back to medieval times. Menéndez Pidal (p. 302) lists Augustus Caesar's pronunciation *simus* (instead of *sumus*) and the Old Spanish forms *seemos* and *seyemos* as early sources for Consuelo's *semos*. He also (p. 292) says that *haiga* was often used by classical Spanish writers but is now used only by "el vulgo." Cerda cites current usage of the form in Argentina, México, Texas, and New Mexico in the New World and in the Spanish provinces of Asturias and Galicia. Rachel's *salemos*, like other verbs listed by Cerda (*vivemos*, *siguemos*, *muremos*, *pidemos*, *durmemos*), is undoubtedly related by analogy to *dicemos*, used by her mother. In discussing the vowel dissimilations that took place in early Spanish, Menéndez Pidal (pp. 180, 272) comments that the Latin verb *dīcere* should have become *dicir*, but dissimilation in the vowels produced the standard modern forms *decir*, *decimos*, *decía*, etc. In this respect it is interesting that Lupe and Consuelo always used -*i*- in the stem of this verb (*dicía*, *dicir*, *dicemos*), as well as in *vinir* (*vinía*, *vinimos*). Lupe's *dicemos* is a common paradigmatically analogous form matching the rest of the present tense: *digo*, *dices*, *dice*, *dicen*.

The standard form for the second person singular of the preterit indicative (-*aste*, -*iste*) was not produced by any of the informants; instead these forms were produced: Rosa: *hablates*; Lupe: *cocineates*, *trajites*, *curates*; Consuelo: *usates*, *hicites*, *comites*, *'stuvites*, *quisites*. Cerda lists this form as occurring in Oajaca, Veracruz, and Argentina. Lapesa (p. 358) cites its occurrence in Andalucía also. Menéndez Pidal (pp. 279-280) attributes the development of the form to an analogical -*s* being added to the standard form (-*stes*), because all other second person singular endings have -*s*, and then a subsequent loss of the medial -*s*-. He cites evidence of it in the early eighteenth century but adds that it must be much older because it is also common in Sephardic Spanish, the language of the Jews who were expelled from Spain in the fifteenth century. Lapesa (pp. 302-303, 357-358) gives much the same explanation, with the additional observation that the confusion of *tú* and *vos* (the latter using the -*steis* ending) facilitated the addition of the final -*s* to the singular form.

The preceding discussion on verb forms, as well as much of the discussion on pronunciation, lends considerable support to a fact that seems to be obvious only to linguists: the speech of the uneducated is generally much more conservative than that of the well schooled. The general public, including most educators, tends to think that people who have not had much formal education are grossly guilty of adding all sorts of corrupt forms and pronunciations to the language. I do not intend to imply, of course, that the language of the uneducated is "better" because it has the older, purer forms, but that in attempting to understand why people of different regions and social classes speak differently, much more than mere grammar-textbook rules must be considered--that is, assuming the question to be "Why do they speak as they do?" rather than "Why don't they talk right?"

In this research project we recorded a number of non-standard verb forms that were not mentioned in the historical studies and dictionaries referred to in the preceding discussion. The forms are not unique to Bryan, however, for Gustavo González found them to be used extensively by the informants interviewed for a study of the Spanish of first-graders in Corpus Christi, Texas. Also, Carmen Reyna, the project secretary, reports having heard them in Brownsville.

All present perfect constructions recorded for this study used ha instead of he as the auxiliary verb for the first person singular (Cons: yo ha visto; Lupe: me ha fijado, [yo] ha oído; Lidia: [yo] te ha visto; David: yo nunca ha ido pa' Houston). A possible explanation for the use of the same form for the first and third persons is analogy: the other three commonly used perfective-aspect constructions--past perfect indicative and present and past perfect subjunctive constructions--have the same form for both persons (yo/él + había ido, haya ido, hubiera ido).

González (pp. 60-65) found widespread "misuse" of the subjunctive, conditional and imperfect tense forms by the informants in his study. The findings of the present study indicate that the matter is probably one of language development. Except in a very limited number of verbs, the adults used standard forms for both present and past subjunctive constructions. Only two of the children produced sentences that called for the subjunctive mood, all of them deviant in some way. Except for one instance (*supongamos*), none of the children seemed to have even the slightest difficulty understanding present and past subjunctive forms when Carmen used them in asking questions or making comments. Five of the sentences were produced by Rachel, who is 12, and one by Roy, who is 11:

(1) Rach: ¿Cómo se *diga* "Monday" en español?
(2) Rach: Y la dejas ahi hasta cuando *es* caliente y la dejas ahi y se tosta sola.
(3) Rach: Y necesita voltearlos también, después cuando (después de que) *están* tostadas.
(4) Rach: En esa . . . 'onde pone las tortillas pa' que se *cozan*.
(5) Rach: Y después los osos [le] dijeron que *vinía* pa'tras (que *volviera*).
(6) Roy: . . . si no creía en Jesús que se *juía*.

In (1) Rachel has simply used a subjunctive verb where an indicative form would be appropriate, and in (2) and (3) she has done the opposite. The only mistake in (4) is that she did not change the stem vowel (*cuezan*), an error which also occurs in the indicative verb *tuesta* in (2). All four children had difficulty with verbs that change the stem vowel, as well as with irregular verbs. In (5) and (6) imperfect indicative forms have been used instead of the past subjunctive; the adults also did so occasionally, as will be shown later. González (p. 61) cites *juía* as an analogical form used both for *iba* and *había* by first-graders in Corpus Christi.

Lidia, who is 16, had little trouble with either the present or past subjunctive:

(7) (describing how to make flour tortillas) . . . y le echas la agua, hasta que no se *haga* . . . . Pero no muy aguada, no más que *quede* . . . , tú sabes. Pero que no *quede* muy aguada, porque se pega.

(8) Chance que te *haiga* visto.

(9) Mientras que 'tás 'prendiendo, te pagaba eso, pero ya que *sabieras*, él te pagaba más.

In (7) she left two clauses incomplete, but the three subjunctive verbs are grammatical. In (8) the subjunctive verb, though a dialectal form, is appropriate for the complement of the regional form *chance que*. In (9) she simply has treated *saber* as a regular verb rather than saying *supieras*. (In (7) and (9), as Rachel did in (2-4), she is using the stylistic second person form of address commonly used in describing procedures, and not, as it would seem, addressing me in the familiar.)

Quite obviously, there are not enough examples in this small amount of data to justify more than speculative comments, but the contrast between Rachel and Lidia cannot be slighted. At first, both tried to make me believe that they did not have full command of Spanish, but as shown in Carmen's interview with Rachel and mine with Lidia and her parents, they can communicate quite well in the language. The contrast in their mastery of the subjunctive suggests that these formal and semantic distinctions are not fully mastered until after the age of 12, but this mastery may normally take place at an earlier age in speakers who have not experienced the anxieties of living in a bicultural area where the use of their family language stigmatizes them socially. More detailed studies on language development must be made before conclusions can be drawn on questions such as those raised by the findings of this research project. Also, just the tensions inherent in interview situations could have created additional anxieties that resulted in Rachel's feeling much less secure than she ordinarily would have felt in using the more difficult constructions.

The adults used the standard forms for the present and past subjunctive except for a very limited inventory of verbs. Sotero used only one subjunctive form *(quisiera)* and his father only four (*haga*, *sea*, *tenga*, *esté*). Lupe and Consuelo used considerably more, with the relative number of subjunctive forms paralleling the amount of Spanish used by each (Lupe 4210 words, Consuelo 2970, David 1300, and Sotero 160). Lupe used ten in the present tense, including one dialect form (*haigas*), and twelve in the past, all of them in the standard form. Consuelo used two in the present tense and eight in the past, with only one being deviant in form, and it might have resulted simply from a slip of the tongue:

(10) Si uno *entraja* a mi casa dijera, ". . . ."

In a conditional sentence Consuelo also used the standard past perfect subjunctive forms:

(11) Yo hubiera querido que no me hubiera enseñado a hacer tortillas.

In answer to a question, however, she used the imperfect form of the verb when the past subjunctive would have been standard:

(12) DL: Si pudiera trabajar en algo . . ., ¿qué preferiría hacer?

CONS: Pos lo que *podía* hacer. (pudiera hacer)

In another of her sentences the conditional or present indicative might have been more appropriate, but the imperfect has a meaning that could be appropriate for the sentence, with a shift in time reference within the sentence:

(13) Yo gasto más gas en ir pa' 'llá a comprar esa cosa barata cuando *podía* comprarla aquí.

Thus, Consuelo's performance with respect to these forms is rather close to the standard, a fact that is particularly noteworthy in view of the fact that she did not speak Spanish during most of her childhood.

Lupe produced several nonstandard constructions. González noted that his informants had a strong tendency to use an imperfect tense form for the conditional and the past subjunctive (Consuelo's errors in (11) and (12)); Lupe did so also, but only with forms of *ser*, *ir*, and *dar*. In answer to a question about what she would do if she were confronted by a dangerous robber, she gave the following answer:

(14) Se me hace que yo lo que *haría*, pos, . . . yo creo, me *pondría* muy nerviosa y con muncho miedo. Yo lo primero *iba* (*sería*) que . . . lo primero que *pensaría* *era* (*sería*, *fuera*) "¡Ay, Dios!" O le *pidiera* a Dios, yo creo, en ese caso. Y también, yo creo, se me hace, si me dicían pos dinero, o lo que me *pidiera*, yo creo que es lo que les *daba* (*daría*), pa' ver si *iban* (se *irían*?) pronto o algo.

This is the only passage in which she uses these imperfect tense forms in this way. On another occasion she used *iban* for *habían*:

(15) Despues, pos pusimos el radio allí y oí que lo *iban* (*habían*) traído al hospital.

She produced two other sentences with some rather complex constructions that use forms generally not covered in traditional grammar books:

(16) Le *jueran dicho* pa' que los dejara que lo agarraran.

(17) Y luego dijo 'amá, "*Fueran yido* . . . que pa' 'cá en Brownsville también."

In (16) and (17) the form of the word itself would indicate that the past subjunctive of either *ser* or *ir* is used as an auxiliary verb to indicate perfective aspect, but that would be an extremely unusual application of either verb. When I discussed these sentences with Carmen, using her as a native--though linguistically sophisticated--informant, one of her first comments was that the construction is very complicated --an understatement indeed. She would use *hubieran* instead of Lupe's *jueran* and *fueran* in each sentence. The general meaning of the verb construction is what might be termed "conditional advisability or desirability," as reflected in an alternative way of saying the sentences, given here with the English translations:

(16') Le deberían haber dicho pa' que los dejara que lo agarraran.

You should have told him so that he would let you get it. (referring to a dog that the children wanted)

(17') Y luego dijo 'amá, "Deberían haber ido [allí]. . . que pa' 'cá en Brownsville también [hay cabrito]."

And then my mother said, "You should have gone [here] . . . over here in Brownsville also [there's cabrito]."

The intended meaning of (17) had to be figured out from the context, because the sentence was spoken rather fast, with an anacoluthon in the middle of it, as indicated by the ellipsis.

These few examples are certainly not a large enough sample to serve as the basis for broad generalizations on the matter, but it is clear at any rate that the problem area is rather limited in scope and, in view of the small number of verbs involved, is very likely dialectal. Thus, in the speech of the adults, of the 15 present subjunctive forms used, only 1 was dialectal and the remainder standard; of the 25 past subjunctive forms used, including the perfective constructions, only 1 was deviant and 2 were dialectal or anomalous; the total number of conditional forms was not counted but there were 4 imperfect tense forms used in conditional clauses and one in a subjunctive clause.

The speakers in this survey produced a number of regional and dialectal vocabulary items. Some of them are rather clearly borrowings from English, but most of them occur elsewhere in the Spanish-speaking world. In the following list I have given the approximate English translation for the word as used by the speaker and have made additional comments where they would be of interest; the words have other meanings too, of course. If the word, with this particular meaning, is mentioned by any of the works listed at the beginning of this paper, the geographical distribution and other comments from that source are also given. If only Cerda appears below, that means that the term is used widely in Texas but not attested elsewhere; if only FJS (Francisco J. Santamaría) is written, the word is widely used in México. As in the preceding discussion, state or province names will be given only for México and Spain, and of course Texas and New Mexico. The abbreviation Acad refers to the dictionary of the Real Academia Española, and MP refers to Menéndez Pidal's work. The label "used by common people" is used here when the source called the term a vulgarismo.

agarrar - to acquire, in many extended senses. Acad: figurative and informal. The informants used this word with a wide enough range of senses to justify further research into its use in Texas and México (e.g., example 16).

arrear - to drive a car; usually refers only to animals. Cerda: northern México, Texas, New Mexico.

asina - variant of así - to a certain degree, as in asina grandote 'this big'; having certain unspecified qualities, as in algo así 'something like that." Both forms were used by all the adults. Cerda: Texas, New Mexico. FJS: common in all of America. MP: an analogical form; archaic and dialectal; used in Old Spanish in the Toledo-Burgos-León region.

atole - a food made of cereal grains, originally corn; may be either thick or liquid-like in consistency; borrowed from Nahuatl. FJS: una bebida, used very much in México. Acad: same comment as FJS.

aventón - a hard, rude push. Cerda: Texas, Guadalajara, Perú. FJS: used by common people. Acad: México.

bien - an adverb, meaning 'very,' used as a modifier of adjectives. Acad: may modify a past participle with this meaning.

bísquete - American-style biscuit. Cerda: northern México, Texas, New Mexico.

blanquillo - chicken or bird egg. Cerda: Texas, México, Guatemala. FJS: now used by people in all social classes. This word is often considered nonstandard for huevo.

bolillo - equivalent to gringo, an Anglo; somewhat pejorative. Cerda: Texas, New Mexico. The first time Consuelo used the word in my presence, she hesitated and laughed, but later she used it without hesitation. Lupe used it only in the interview conducted by Carmen. Lidia used it as a common term. Consuelo also used the adjective boliachi to refer to a Mexican-American who talks and acts like an Anglo.

cocinear - to cook. The women occasionally used the standard cocinar. Unlike arrear, the phonological hiatus was maintained after the e; for example, Lupe said arrias, but cocineé and cocinea, the only nonfinite forms of these verbs that were produced. The -ear ending is also very common for Mexican coinages based on English words, as in cuquear 'to cook.'

contimás - somewhat like the English idiomatic expressions "let alone," "not to mention," etc. Cerda: Texas, Colombia. FJS: a generalized form that has completely replaced the standard cuánto más; used in Spain, among the lower classes in Mexico City, and in the interior of the country. Acad: used by common people for cuánto más; cuantimás, a contraction of cuánto más.

chamaco - child, through the high school age. Cerda: Texas, New Mexico, México, Central America, Colombia. FJS: from the Aztec chamauac 'chubby'; in Central America and other parts of America. Acad: México.

chance - borrowing from the English chance, also said as chanza; indicates possibility, opportunity, probability, and may be used in a variety of expressions. Cerda: lists chanza in Texas and New Mexico. FJS: Used by bilinguals in the southwestern U. S.; "a superfluous and unnecessary anglicism."

chango - monkey. Cerda: Texas, México, Colombia; machango in Cuba and Venezuela. FJS: "mono pequeño." The standard word mono refers to larger animals, such as apes, also. The children seemed to be more familiar with the word mono than the grandparents were; by chance, both groups were engaged in discussions about the two words.

Chifonía - dresser, chest of drawers. Cerda: chifonir; in Argentina, chiffonier.

chueco - twisted, crooked. Cerda: Texas, México. FJS: used very much. The castillian meaning is 'bow-legged' or 'badly crippled.'

dientista - variant of dentista. Cerda: Texas, Guanajuato.

duro - difficult; hard, as in 'to work hard.' Cerda: Texas, Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, Perú, Uruguay. FJS: lists the second meaning. Acad: lists these meanings as figurative or informal usages.

gente - family, as in *mi gente* 'my children, etc.' Acad: informal.

greve - gravy. (I would list this as an English word if it had been produced by anyone except David and Rosa; the latter does not speak English.) David also said *grevecito*.

guachonga - rude, nosy. None of the sources listed it, and no one I asked seemed to have heard it before. Perhaps it is a pejorative adjective based on *guachar*, which Cerda lists as 'to look after, take care of,' from the English *watch*.

guapo - hard-working, resourceful. Cerda: Texas, northern México. FJS: used by common people in northern México. The Castillian meaning for the word is 'handsome, pretty.'

hacerse - an impersonal construction equivalent to *parecer*; e.g., *se me hace* 'It seems to me.' Not listed elsewhere. It is so widely used in Texas that it deserves more study.

huerco - a child younger than fifteen or so. Cerda: northern México and southwestern U. S. FJS: used by common people, equivalent to *chamaco*; northern México, southwestern U. S.

huevón - extremely lazy. Cerda: lists other meanings for the word in other parts of America. FJS: a lower class term.

jamaica - a charity sale held by a church or other such organization. Cerda, FJS, and Acad: México.

jiriola - an adjective referring to a person who acts without regard to the appearance he is giving of himself as a result of his action; used primarily with verbs of motion such as *venir* or *andar*. Cerda: said of a person who goes around very satisfied with himself, in spite of the inappropriateness of the circumstances.

mero - used in a number of idiomatic eppressings, as in *ya mero* 'almost' and *donde mero* 'exactly where.' FJS: in Central America, equivalent to *exactamente*; also México, Acad: "inappropriately" used in México in the senses given here.

mixteado - from the English word *mixed*. Cerda lists the past participle with this meaning, without comment.

muncho - variant pronunciation of *mucho* 'much.' Cerda, Acad: México. David did not use this pronunciation, and Lidia vacillated between *mucho* and *muncho*; the others consistently used *muncho*.

nadien - variant of nadie 'nobody.' Cerda: Campeche, Michoacán, Colombia. MP: all of Spain and America; an analogous form related to alguien.

no más - only; no more; no longer. Lapesa: the phrase has extended its meanings considerably in America.

onde - variant of donde 'where,' both as an interrogative and an adverbial relative. Cerda: New Mexico, Texas, all of America.

pa' - to, toward, for. Cerda: Texas, New Mexico, México. FJS. MP: lists as a careless pronunciation of para but gives no geographical distribution. All of the speakers said it, but occasionally they also said para in certain constructions. David usually used para.

parquearse - to park a car. Cerda: U. S., México. FJS. A Spaniard whom I met in 1962 said that the verb is widely used in Spain also, despite lack of Academy acceptance.

pos - variant of pues, the interjection 'well.' Cerda: Texas, New Mexico. FJS: very informal usage among country people, principally in central and northern México. David tended to use pues, and Lupe used it occasionally; the others always used pos.

prebar - variant of probar 'to taste.'

queque - American-style cake. Cerda: Texas, New Mexico, México, Central America, Colombia, Venezuela, Perú. FJS: generalized anglicism. Consuelo said queique, a variant form listed by FJS.

qué tanto - interrogative form for 'how much.' Not mentioned in any of the sources, not even as a variant of cuánto, the standard form, which was never used by these speakers.

ranchero - adj. referring to a person with somewhat unsophisticated manners, pejoratively applied to rural people. Cerda: Texas, Mexico. FJS.

raspa - a snow cone, a refreshment made of fruit-flavored syrup poured over crushed ice. Cerda.

traer - equivalent to tener 'to have.'

traste - dish, usually plural. Cerda: Texas, Mexico. FJS: Acad: America, Andalucía.

trinche - fork. FJS: Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Ecuador, Chile, La Plata River area.

velís - suitcase. Cerda: veliz; Texas and México. FJS: disapproves of the spelling veliz.

vesita - variant of *visita* 'guest, visitor.' Not listed anywhere, but I have heard it on numerous occasions.

vez - occasion. The form *a veces* 'sometimes' alternated with *hay veces*, *hay veces que*, *en veces*, all of which are commonly used in Texas. Acad: lists only *a veces*.

vista - movie, motion picture. Cerda: Texas, New Mexico.

weldear - to weld, as opposed to soldering. Cerda: *hueldear*.

yarda - lawn; the general meaning of the English *yard*. Cerda: Texas and New Mexico.

zacate - grass. FJS: México, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica. Acad: México, Central America, Philippines.

A number of words listed above might appear to be English words and thus perhaps should not have been included so as to give the impression that they enjoy the status of fully legitimate Spanish words (e.g., *bísquete*, *chance*, *chifonía*, *greve*, *guachonga*, *mixteado*, *weldear*, *yarda*). It is not a simple matter to draw precise lines, as the comments in the entries indicate. In the case of *greve* and *yarda*, for instance, there is a good chance that they have been used by some monolingual Spanish-speakers in the southwestern United States for at least three or four generations. Did Rosa learn *greve* from her mother? How many generations back did her family pick up the word in an employer's kitchen? Precisely how widely and how long must a new word have to be used by native speakers before it ceases to carry a "foreign" label? Or, how many miles away does the word have to travel before it ceases to be directly associated with its parent language and is no longer deplored as "foreign"?

Another question that is not resolved very easily is how one distinguishes between borrowing a foreign semantic distinction and the semantic generalization or specialization that develops naturally within a language. Such is the case for *arrear* as described above. Since the words *drive* and *arrear* have many similar syntactic and semantic distinctions, it is tempting to say that the Spanish word has been expanded under the pressures of English usage, but it would be more accurate to attribute the expansion to cultural or technological developments that by chance took place first in an English-speaking country. The semantic expansion was borrowed--or developed--along with the technological development. A purist might deplore this semantic development because the history of the expansion contains non-native influences.

Borrowing should not be confused with interference, though it is not always clear which is taking place in a particular construction. For instance, when Consuelo said, in a side comment, "'Tán corriendo el marrano," she seemed to be saying that someone was chasing a pig, in which case the verb *corretear*, not *correr*, should have been used. (The context did not clarify exactly what she meant.) Since she is English-dominant, it is likely that she was thinking about "running after it" or "running it away," with *correr* being the expected translation of the principal word in her thoughts. It is also possible that she has always confused *correr* with *corretear*--that is, that she never produces the word *corretear*. The confusion, whether it occurred earlier when she learned the word or at the time when she produced the sentence, appears to be a clear case of her knowledge of English interfering with her production of Spanish.

Language interference that involves pronunciation is much clearer. By "interference" I am referring to the use of deviant forms, and not simply accent. For instance, Consuelo said *garache* rather than *garaje*, undoubtedly because of her knowledge of English. That pronunciation, of course, would be acceptable had the French word not already been borrowed and adapted to Spanish phonology and spelling. Lupe made a similar "error" in treating the verb for *touch* as if it were an English borrowing rather than a native word. She said *tochar* instead of *tocar*. This sort of nonstandard production (alteration) of certain words is very common in Texas. Consuelo produced two other interesting forms. When we were naming household items, she said *redio*, translating the sound of the English vowel into an approximate Spanish vowel; after Lupe and I said the word in the standard form, of course, she also said it the way we did. In naming a vaporizer that was nearby, she produced *vepadora* and did not know *vaporizadora*. In the present discussion I am perhaps using the term "interference" in a unique way, but it seems to be that a distinction should be made between deviant forms such as these and mere accent.

The children, as one would expect, had more difficulty in selecting standard Spanish words and constructions to express their thoughts and produced more interference-induced deviant forms. Rachel used *cucamos* as well as *cocinar* and *guisar*. In saying that her grandmother had moved, she first said *movió*, the standard form, but a few sentences later said *muvió*. Both Rachel and Robert used the verb *naquear* in saying that Goldilocks knocked on the bear's door, with the same vowel sound as the English verb, whereas the standard practice would be to change the vowel to conform to the borrowed spelling, as in the boxing term *noquear* 'to knock out.' In another sentence Rachel went through a rather complicated translation process in selecting the verb:

(18) Le quitaron al dungeon.

Quitar means 'to take away *from*' and not what she means, *llevar* 'to take away *to*.' Rachel also produced an interesting noun: *saquetín*, a combination of *sock* and *calcetín*.

Several errors were made in applying the pluralization rules. Rachel said *los leóns*, following English morphology (but with /s/ rather than the standard English /z/), whereas Spanish pluralization rules call for a syllable for the plural of words ending with -*n*: *los leones*. Three times Sally said *una veces*, failing to add the -*s* to *una*. Roy also said *una veces* on one occasion. Rachel said *su camas* once, the same error. In these last phrases the children followed the English practice of adding the -*s* only to the noun, but Spanish also adds an -*s* to all modifiers of a plural noun.

In other phrases the children followed English word order and translated word for word from English to Spanish. Rachel, Roy, and Robert used pa' 'trás 'toward the rear, backward' with a verb of motion, as in nunca vino pa' 'trás for "She never came back," instead of using volvió. Roy produced la metió pa' 'trás to indicate that someone put his hand back into his pocket, rather than using the standard verb construction la volvió a meter or the phrase la metió otra vez. Rachel and Robert produced some interesting possessive constructions:

(19) Rach: la chiquito oso cama (the little bear's bed)
(20) Robt: el baby bear 'taba buena (the baby bear's was good)
(21) Robt: the bear sopera (the bear's soup bowl)
(22) Robt: su 'apá estaba (his father's was)

The word order in these phrases suggests that the children were thinking in English but speaking with Spanish words. In (19) there is double evidence of English interference: the word order in chiquito oso as well as the placement of the genitive before the head noun. The children did not make the phrases conform to English completely, for la and cama and chiquito and oso properly show gender, and none of the possessives used the final -'s, which is uniquely English.

As can be seen from the data presented throughout this paper, the informants for this project do indeed speak Spanish, that is, a dialect of Spanish, and that dialect fits into the overall historical development of all dialects throughout the Spanish-speaking world. It is particularly interesting that most of the nonstandard forms found in these interviews also occur in México, and many of them also occur in Spain. English has obviously had an effect on the dialect, but has served mainly as the source for lexical borrowing. In only a few instances, principally among the children and the one English-dominant adult interviewed, was clear evidence found of English interference. Their accent--that is, the actual pronunciation and intonation--was not treated in this paper, but only the children seem to experience the kind of systematic influence that might eventually produce an English-like accent.

Of particular interest is the fact that such a small number of "corruptions" have crept into the language of these informants, whereas popular notions about the relationship of formal education to the preservation of the "grammar" of a language would lead one to expect a much higher number of them. None of these informants has had any formal instruction in Spanish, and the grandparents never attended school, though the grandfather indicated that on his own he had learned to read "poquito español y escribir poquito español." This last fact might help explain why he did not use certain of the obviously "bad" forms such as *muncho*, *pos*, and *pa'*. If one reflects upon the matter, one notices that the deviant forms that are common--and are deplored as corruptive--occur primarily in the highly irregular verbs, in certain expressions with a very high rate of incidence in spoken language, and in the semantic areas in which English borrowings would be most likely to occur.

V. THE MIXING OF ENGLISH AND SPANISH

By Donald M. Lance

As explained in Paper I of this report, the mixing of English and Spanish within the same sentence or general statement is related to the relaxed nature of the social setting in which it occurs. As will be shown by examples below, the language switching does not occur simply because the speaker does not know a particular word in one language or the other; rather the word or phrase that is most available at the moment for some usually unexplainable reason is the one that comes out. Nor is there a distinct tendency for the shifting to go in one direction rather than the other, though when only one word from the other language is used it is most often an English word in a Spanish sentence.

In the first part of this discussion, only the language of the two women will be considered; the children's language will be treated later in the paper. The discussion will be largely anecdotal, treating three general types of mixing, in the following order:

1. Single words or terms inserted into a sentence
    a. Quasi-technical terms
    b. Brand names
    c. Place names
    d. Personal names
    e. Tag questions
    f. Interjections, adverbs, etc.
    g. Numbers
2. Longer phrases or clauses
    a. Spanish to English
    b. English to Spanish
    c. Spanish to English to Spanish
    d. English to Spanish to English

3. Quotations
    a. Spanish introductions to English quotations
    b. Mixed quotations

One of the most common uses of English words in otherwise Spanish sentences is the adoption of what might be termed quasi-technical terminology, words that have specialized uses in American culture or technology. Often the word is adapted morphologically and becomes at least temporarily a loan word, such as *troca* (truck), *diche* (ditch), *pompa* (pump), *paipa* (pipe), *queque* (cake), etc., but there are others that phonologically and morphologically appear to be simply English words used in Spanish sentences, as in the following examples:

(1) LUPE: ¿Sabes componer *flats*? [flæts]

(2) CONS: Pero cuando tienen que hacer munchos, y tienen ese--¿cómo se nombra?--*piece work*, ...

(3) LUPE: Más antes yo antes de trabajar sí les hacía *pies*.

(4) SOT: A mediodía, pos, uno podía comer *hamburgers*.

(5) CONS: Ya lo compra mixteado.
LUPE: No, nomás la *filling*. La *pie crust* la hago con harina, manteca, y poquita espauda y sal. Y luego la *meringue* la hago con ... los *egg whites* ... la clara.

Some of these terms can be translated into Spanish rather easily, as in the use of *trabajo por pedazo* (which was also used earlier in the same conversation) and the recently adopted *hamburguesas* for *hamburgers*, but the word *pasteles* may not fully suffice for *pies* since it also applies to cakes, and there does not appear to be a word for *flat* except for recent coinages such as *puntura*, *ponche*, etc.--at least no single word has been included in recent editions of bilingual dictionaries available to the author. The terms in (5) also could be translated, but with some loss in specificity. In each of these words the phonology used was that of English, though produced with the speaker's own particular accent. (Words that are adapted to Spanish morphology and phonology are treated in Paper IV.)

Spanish words used in English sentences were limited largely to such terms as *tortilla*, *enchilada*, and *taco*, for which there are no equivalent terms in English. The speakers, however, occasionally pronounced Spanish words with some English phonology (e.g., with a retroflex [r] and a final [ə] in *tortilla* and with a slightly aspirated [tʿ] in *taco*). When one considers the implication of the cultural dominance in the area, this constrast is not surprising. Other terms have near equivalents in English which could be used but usually are not. *Chile* can be translated as *pepper*, but references to *chile* in Mexican cookery would include only certain kinds of pepper. On a different, but still cultural topic, we always used the term *curandero* because *witch doctor* has connotations that do not apply to the South Texas *curandero*. (The second generation in this discussion disclaimed having faith in *curanderos*, though they commented that the older generations still depend on them. There are no *curanderos* in Bryan, they reported.)

Many individual words and terms receive ambivalent treatment because they are not always translatable. For instance, Lupe said,

(6) LUPE: Vivo 'horita en diciséis ... sixteen hundred
por la *Lucky Street*,

with a burst of nervous laughter as she switched to English for the numbers, but her husband, with a little less hesitation, but some nervous laughter said,

(7) SOT: Vivo en ... este ... uno seis cero cero *Lucky*.

Both pronounced the street name with the English vowel [ə˞] , and by no means would either have translated the street to "La Calle de la Suerte." Though neither of the women used *calle*, Lupe consistently used the feminine article with street names, as when she was explaining the location of a bakery:

(8) LUPE: ... en la *Bryan* (Street) ... al otro lado del
del *A&P* ...

with both *Bryan* and *A&P* receiving standard English pronunciation. Occasionally the switching back and forth between the phonology of Spanish and English caused problems, as shown in this short exchange in which both trade names and quasi-technical terms are used.

(9) CONS: ¿La ... la marca?
LUPE: La *Betty Crocker*.

CONS: Ay, tú! (laughter) Veces la *Hines*.

LUPE: *Pillsburr* .... (laughs) Ya no podía hablar.

CAR: Ya se trabó la lengua.

LUPE: No, este ... a mí me gustó los queques así ... de cajita.

CAR: A mí me gustan porque son rápidos.

CONS: Están más sabrosos ... están más sabrosos los homemades.

The names of cities, unlike street names, often are translatable since so many of them are Spanish in origin. In referring to *San Antonio* and *San Benito* the speakers sometimes said them in English and sometimes in Spanish (including *San Antone*), regardless of which language the sentence was in. For other names, such as *Bryan* and *Houston*, the usual Spanish pronunciation would not be appreciably different from the pronunciation in English with a Spanish accent, but others such as *Caldwell* are not easily adapted to Spanish phonology. None of these names are changed much from the English pronunciation. The most interesting exchange regarding place names occurred with the grandparents, who understandably would have more difficulty in adapting place names to English pronunciation. The grandmother said that she was born in *'l Hondo*, with the reduced proclitic article. I perceived it as *Londo* or perhaps *London* but knew of no such town in South Texas. Her husband, who knows more English, clarified the matter by saying it in English, "Hondo City," using the English pronunciation [hando] without the Spanish article. The article is not included in the official name of the town, though Spanish-speaking citizens apparently use *El Hondo* for both the town and the river by that name. The grandfather said that they also had lived in Jourdanton, pronounced [ǰɛːᵈn̩tən] , which I could not understand until I realized that he had used a predictable phonological translation of the rather interesting pronunciation used by the English-speaking citizens of the town: [ǰɝdn̩tən].

The pronunciation of personal names also receives ambivalent treatment, as does the naming of children in families that are becoming anglicized. The names of the third-generation informants in this project are Rachel, Roy, Robert, Sally, and Judy, the latter from a family across the street. As Lupe talked about her older daughter, she sometimes said *Rachel* [réčəl] and sometimes *Raquel* [ř̀ɑkɛ́l], and the final vowel in Sally's name was sometimes the tense Spanish [i] and sometimes the lax English vowel [ɪ]. Likewise, the younger boy was sometimes called *Robert* and sometimes *Roberto*, whether he was present or simply the topic of conversation--regardless of the language being used. Lupe also used several different forms for the name of her husband: [sotɛɾo], [sətɛro], [tɛɾo], [tɛᵊro], and [tɛrɪ]. (The [r] here indicates a retroflex English *r* and the [ɾ] the flapped Spanish *r*.) The neighbor when speaking English pronounced her name [gæ̂ᵊlvɛ́ᵊz], but [gálvɛs] in Spanish conversations. No attempt was made in this study to explore the psychological implications of the use of both language systems in the use of personal names, though perhaps it should be mentioned that one cannot assume that any particular individual responds the same to, for instance, *Robert* and *Roberto*. For example, if an individual's name is *Roberto* and he identifies very strongly with Mexican-American culture and has certain anxieties regarding anglicization (or de-hispanicization), he may resent having a teacher or even his parents call him *Robert*--even worse *Bob* or *Bobby*.

Often the additional word from the other language is a simple phrase like a tag question, interjection, adverb, or false start, as in these:

(10) LUPE: I mean, I can't drive standard, ¿*tú*? (meaning a car with standard transmission)

(11) CONS: Oh, they make like invitations and all that, ¿*no*?

(12) CONS: It's about the same, ¿*no*?

(13) LUPE: *Pero*, ... *este* ... I'm so tired on Fridays, *que ¡jiji!*

(14) LUPE: *Pues*, yeah, I want to go.

(15) LUPE: *Pos* they didn't know who it was.

(16) CONS: *Pos* if you want something good, that's the way to make 'em.

(17) CONS: *Since* ... como a gusta, este, sí.

(18) CONS: *Pero* ... what I think about that is they're way out there.

(19) CONS: *Y* ... *y* ... and you've seen 'em in things, you know.

The switching process is not always instantaneous and complete, however; in (17), for example, the speaker pronounced *pero* with a strong Texan English accent, including a diphthongized [ɛᵊ] , a retroflex [r] , and an off-glide at the end of the word.

Rather often brief little English phrases carrying little semantic information are inserted into Spanish sentences:

(20) LUPE: Porque perdió un libro que resultó rompido, *or something like that*.

(21) CONS: Hay unos que son muy--cómo se dice--muy rancheros *or something*.

(22) LUPE: *I mean*, cuando voy a comprar algo, al pueblo, ... I don't like to take them with me.

(23) CONS: *I think*, yo gasto más gas en ir pa' 'llá a comprar esa cosa barata.

(24) CONS: *I mean*, si hay una persona que no puede hablar inglés, tengo que hablarlo.

(25) CONS: [El padre] quiere hablar español, pero--*I mean*, mejicano--pero habla más como hablan en España que aquí.

No such Spanish expressions were used in English sentences, though it would not have been surprising if an occasional *y todo eso*, *tú sabes*, or *este* were to be interjected into English sentences, since they occurred so often in Spanish sentences.

Many of the lapses into English in otherwise Spanish sentences are related to the fact that certain terms, in addition to the quasi-technical expressions mentioned earlier, are used most often in situations that call for English. The street address in (6) is one such example. There is ample evidence in the tapes that the informants knew the numbers in Spanish, because when talking about such topics as the number of children in the family, there was no hesitation in producing them, and the children did some counting. The following examples reveal the tendency to think of prices in English, though they also can be expressed in Spanish very easily:

(26) CONS: I think, yo gasto más gas en ir pa' 'llá a comprar esa cosa barata cuando podía comprarla aquí.

LUPE: And then you can buy it here for two or three pennies más.

CONS: Maybe two-three pennies more, but you usates más pa' ir pa' 'llá. I think you use more than two pennies or three pennies worth of gas.

(27) LUPE: En la tienda trae un paquetita por ... I think it's seventeen.

(28) LUPE: Las tortillas [de la tortillería] se los venden en ... let's see, I think it's a dozen for fifteen, las las dos docenas por thirty. En el paquete .... En las tiendas están más caro. Me parece diecisiete o dieciocho.

(29) LUPE: La otra vez me hizo que comprara un roast asina grandote. Costó como four something.

Other examples of dependence on English numbers were found but not in large enough quantity to indicate a distinct tendency.

(30) CONS: Fíjate, yo me levanto a las cuatro de la ma ... cuatro ... four thirty.

(31) LUPE: Bajé, yo creo, como ten pounds.

In many sentences much longer phrases or clauses from the two languages occur. The scope of this paper is not broad enough to allow for a detailed analysis of the interplay between the two grammatical systems in these sentences, though it would be both possible and desirable to do so; instead only a few representative samples will be given here, in four groups--Spanish-to-English (32-35), English-to-Spanish (36-42), Spanish-to-English-to-Spanish (43-45), and English-to-Spanish-to-English (46-47):

(32) CONS: Como digo, they don't try.

(33) LUPE: Te digo que este dedo has been bothering me so much.

(34) LUPE: A Sotero le gusta mucho cocinar barbecue every Sunday ... every Saturday.

(35) LUPE: Entonces me dijeron que la pusiera una en el cuarto, pa' que it'd get rid of the dust or todo eso.

(36) LUPE: I think I was mopping y me pegué asina.

(37) LUPE: It doesn't matter if you tore it or ... o lo que haigas hecho.

(38) LUPE: When, you know, I buy one que tiene hueso.

(39) LUPE: Oh, I mean, you can buy the [taco] shells ya ya hechas asina.

(40) CONS: But this arthritis deal, boy, you get to hurtin' so bad you can't hardly even ... 'cer masa pa' tortillas.

(41) CONS: ¿Are you sure que hay asina, porque pos no en todos hay?

(42) LUPE: Just when they get shoes or les voy a comprar vestido o algo asina, 'tonces sí los llevo.

(43) LUPE: Se me hace que I have to respect her porque 'tá ... (older).

(44) CONS: Le saco la semilla esa y se le echa el hamburger meat y el queso y todo eso y you let 'em fry real slow en ... en el sartén.

(45) LUPE: Y en ratos me dan ganas de pop up and dicir, "Ay ...."

(46) CONS: Yeah, but I buy 'em mostly pa' 'l hamburger meat.

(47) LUPE: Yeah, and one thing about them ... les gusta tochar todo, and I'm afraid they're gonna break it and I don't have enough money to pay for it.

The variety found in these sixteen citations suggests that there are perhaps no syntactic restrictions on where the switching can occur, for it takes place in the following environments:

1. In compound structures
    a. compound sentences: before (36,47) or after (42,44) the conjunction, or with the conjunction repeated (37)
    b. compound sentence elements: before (44) or after (45) the conjunction
2. Between major syntactic elements
    a. between the subject and the verb (33)
    b. between the verb and the complement (34,41)
    c. between a noun and post-posed modifier (38,39)
    d. between adverbial clauses or phrases and the main clause (32, 35, 43, 44)
    e. between the verb and an adverb of place (46)
3. Within major syntactic groups
    a. between the article and the noun (44, 46)
    b. between the auxiliary and the main verb (40)
    c. after a preposition (45)
    d. after a subordinating conjunction (35, 43)

The reader will recall from the preceding discussion that the primary criterion for considering these to be examples of switching rather than borrowing is that, for example in hamburger meat in (44), the phonology, morphology, and syntax are basically English.

Another interesting mixture of longer segments occurs in quotations. When the conversation was in English, both the introduction and the quotation itself were in English, but in mixed conversations the introduction was often in Spanish and the quotation usually in the language used by the persons being quoted:

(48) LUPE: Dice, "Ay," dice, "you're gonna hit it ...." He says I'm a reckless driver. Le digo, "I don't think so." I mean, I just drive the normal way I'd drive to College Station.

(49) CONS: Les dije yo, l'ije, "Well, if she has to pay for it, you let me know and I'll pay for it."

When we were using either English or the mixture, the neighbor said both the introductions and the quotations in English and said both in Spanish during the Spanish conversation, but in the Spanish interview with Carmen she produced the following rather interesting passage:

(50) CONS: Y una vez me dijo mi chamaca, dijo, "Mami, you go there, order me a hamburger basket deluxe." "Are you sure que hay asina, porque pos no en todos hay?" Dijo, "Sí, nomás diles que quieres un hamburger basket deluxe."

Lupe tended to translate the quotation into Spanish when we were speaking either Spanish or the mixture, but she also produced these interesting passages:

(51) LUPE: Y luego dice, "Has he been eatin' good?" y le dije, "no," y luego dice "¿Por qué no lo llevas a this lady que cura eso?"

(52) LUPE: Y luego le dije, "No, Patty," pues este, "get your mother ....," le dije and, I mean, "Si vas a ir a la escuela," I mean .... "Pues, yeah, I wanna go." 'Tonces salió eso que she wanted to take mechanic.

(53) LUPE: Y luego las huercas ahi besándose enfrente. Y le dije, "Mira, Rachel, that's what I don't want to bring you," ... este ... "porque mira si vienes tú sola," le dije, "¿cómo andarás tú también?"

There were no instances of an English introduction to a Spanish quotation in the data collected.

As one can see by observing the preceding examples, the reason for switching from one language to the other is apparently not motivated by gaps in the vocabulary of the speaker. Sufficient evidence was found to indicate that the speaker knew the appropriate words in both languages and simply produced the one that was closest to the tip of the tongue. On a number of occasions they produced both expressions within the same or subsequent utterances--perhaps suggestive of stylistic implications. There are twelve such instances in Lupe's speech and four in Consuelo's. Also there were many other instances in which there is overt evidence that the two women knew both the Spanish and English expressions, but only a few examples will be treated in detail here.

In a conversation about different ways to prepare beans, we had been talking in both languages and had used both *frijoles* and *beans*. When I asked, in English, about the expression "refried beans," the following exchange took place:

(54) DL: Do you ever say "refried beans"?

LUPE: Refritos.

DL: Refritos.

CONS: Um huh. Um huh. Les gustan más.

LUPE: Yo ... yo cuando hago *refritos beans*, ...

Not only the word itself but also the placement and concordance restrictions in the use of the adjective became involved, though *beans* for some reason was pronounced with Spanish phonology.

Several times Lupe produced the word in one language and immediately thereafter repeated it in the other.

(55) LUPE: It's his ... ¿cómo se dice?

CONS: Nephew.

LUPE: Sobrino. Nephew.

(56) LUPE: Hay a pasearse por los ... pa' 'l colegio, de *just driving*. Paseándose.

(57) LUPE: It's *real* easy. 'Tá *bien* easy.

(58) LUPE: No, eso lo compro de *cajita*. Es una *little box* asina y ya viene ....

In three instances she inserted an expression like *tú sabes*:

(59) LUPE: Parece que los tapaba pa' que se ... el vapor ... que se les cayera el skin, el, tú sabes, cuerito.

(60) LUPE: Pos la mitad de él lo hice come en slice, tú sabes, en rebanadas.

(61) LUPE: Y luego los metía ahi y luego en la fat ... en la grease ... tú sabes, en la manteca y quedan bien tostadas.

One might be tempted to assume that in these sentences the tú sabes is a hint that the speaker was asking for confirmation of her choice of words, but since the intonation was very much like that of the current you know in English, this interpretation is rather doubtful. In a couple of other sentences she inserted questions that appear more clearly to be asking for confirmation, but the intonation used was also like that used for tú sabes. A more plausible explanation is that she was searching through her personal lexicon for the one word that would carry the narrowest or most precise range of semantic information in order to satisfy her (subconscious) assessment of the range of her auditors' lexicons.

(62) LUPE: Lo hago con los egg whites ... la clara .... ¿Cómo le dicen a los blanquillos?

(63) LUPE: Qué comidas! Puro atole me dieron, atole de ... de ... este ... ¿cómo se llama? ... ese soup de avena, "cream and wheat" que le dice ella, y el ... este ... me dieron este ... soup ... y ... puros caldos.

In (63) the ellipses indicate pauses. Since atole is a Nahuatl borrowing for porridge, or cornmeal mush, it is an appropriate word for cream of wheat, but since there is no common term in English for cream of wheat, oatmeal, etc. in popular use in this area, Lupe was "at a loss for words" in describing the liquid diet that she had received during a recent stay in the hospital. At the time, she was talking only with Consuelo and Carmen, both of whom knew atole. There was one very interesting instance in which the interviewer pretended not to understand the English expression and got an immediate translation, though the English words were still closest to the tip of her tongue:

(64) LUPE: Yo le echo muchos short cuts.
CAR: ¿Mucha qué?
LUPE: Muchos short cuts ... travesías.

Consuelo's bilingual repetitions are very much like Lupe's, though she used fewer, with this contrast paralleling the number of Spanish words used in the mixed conversations (1492:12::484:4, or approximately 120:1). Three of the repetitions occurred in the same utterance:

(65) CONS: Más chicken y turkey asina. Pollo.

(66) CONS: But what I usually buy are those thick ones, las más gruesas.

(67) CONS: You know, fry that, y luego ... guisar los frijoles en ése.

In the fourth instance about a minute of conversation intervened between her use of the last expressions:

(68) Ella iba por su 'pelativo antes que se casara.

. . . .

Asina de ... en lugar de ... nomás el last name.

In two instances the two women produced the two expressions in response to the same question:

(69) CAR: Pastel sí, ¿pero de qué?
CONS: Lemon ... the most.
LUPE: Andale, a Sotero le gusta tanto el limón.

(70) CONS: I mean, she sounds different than us.
CAR: ¿Diferente?
LUPE: Sí, porque ella está educada y ....
CONS: Muy educated y nosotros pobremente ....

It may have occurred to the reader that well over half of the preceding examples are from the same speaker. This fact reflects the relative amount of English and Spanish that the two speakers used, and the contrast also might be interpreted as a rough measure of language dominance in the two women. Altogether four tapes were made on which the use of the English and Spanish of the two was elicited. Table A shows the total number of words in each language on the tapes.

TABLE A: Words Used by the Adults

Interview		English	o/o	Spanish	o/o
IX	Lupe	487	75	164	25
	Cons	750	89	92	11
	DL	154	86	25	14
XIV-A	Lupe	317	48	346	52
	Cons	1294	89	161	11
	DL	410	73	149	27
XIV-B	Lupe	810	65	415	35
	Cons	1016	95	51	5
	DL	418	88	72	12
XV-A	Lupe	233	29	567	71
	Cons	248	58	180	42
XV-B	Lupe	174	8.5	1854	91.5
	Cons	180	15.5	983	84.5
	Car			829	100
VIII-B	Lupe	20	6.6	283	93.4
	Cons	46	3	1505	97
	DL	5	.7	665	99.3

Interviews IX and XIV consist of conversational interviews conducted by the author in English and Spanish mixed together so as to encourage, though not specifically elicit, sentences like those given in the earlier part of this paper. Interview XIV is divided into two parts because about half-way through the tape I commented that "in mixing English and Spanish the mixture is that you [Lupe] are speaking Spanish and you [Consuelo] are speaking English." They reacted with surprise and said that they had not noticed. My intention was to encourage Consuelo to use more Spanish, but as the table shows, the comment apparently just made all three of us more self-conscious and resulted in our using a higher percentage of English. The first portion of Interview XV consists of mixed English and Spanish with only the two women present in the room; for the last portion of the tape, Carmen Reyna, the project secretary, entered the room and conducted an interview in Spanish. Interview VIII consists of one portion in English and a longer interview in Spanish; only the second part is used here since no Spanish was used in the first portion.

The statistics in Table A are consistent with other facts that merit some discussion at this point. Lupe's family speaks primarily Spanish at home because her parents and in-laws do so. Consuelo's family, on the other hand, speaks English almost exclusively because when Consuelo married she had not spoken Spanish for ten years. When Consuelo was seven her mother died and her father married a "bolilla" (as Consuelo said it, meaning "Anglo") who forced the family to speak only English. When Consuelo married, she had to relearn Spanish because her mother-in-law could not speak English; she continued to speak English at home, however. Thus, Lupe is closer to being Spanish-dominant and Consuelo is decidedly English-dominant, and it is not surprising that Lupe consistently used proportionately more Spanish than Consuelo did, with the sole exception of Interview VIII-B.

The principal reason for Lupe's increased use of Spanish in XIV-A, the second of the interviews, is that when I told her that I wanted to have another session in mixed language I probably hinted that there was an inordinately low amount of Spanish used in the first interview. Interestingly enough, Consuelo, who was simply asked to come over after I arrived, used almost exactly the same percentage of each language in IX and XIV-A. Also, Lupe, being the hostess, would naturally be accommodating in regard to my implicit desires in the interview. Neither informant, however, displayed the least awareness of when she was switching from one language to the other; in fact, on a couple of occasions--but not in a recorded interview--I asked them if they knew whether they had used a Spanish word or an English word in a particular instance, and they truly did not know which they had used. The only such incident caught on tape was in the English interview with Lidia. In a conversation about her trip to the Houston Zoo I asked her if she knew a word for monkey, to which she replied "changos."

Then when I asked if she knew another one, she asked her father in Spanish and in the ensuing conversation she and I spoke both languages, with her father using only Spanish. Suddenly, she looked surprised, said "We talked both languages," and laughed. As the results of the comment at the end of XIV-A show, calling attention to the mixing process can cause a marked change in linguistic behavior. Another indication of the success, or naturalness, of the interviewing done for this project--subjective though it is--is that I could not estimate the proportionate amount of Spanish that I had used and was surprised by the differences in my own speech shown in the statistics for Interviews IX, XIV-A, and XIV-B; I thought I had used much more Spanish in each of the interviews.

Also of interest is that Consuelo tended to dominate the conversation in my interviews, whereas Lupe dominated it in the others. Because Consuelo's step-mother was an Anglo she perhaps identifies with Anglos more readily than Lupe does. As well, she is eleven years older. The age factor also partially explains why Lupe spoke approximately twice as much as Consuelo did in the interview with Carmen. (Their ages: Consuelo 39, Lupe 28, and Carmen 22; the author's 37.)

As was mentioned in Paper I, the reason why the informants used more English with Carmen than with me is that she did not use instructions explicitly designed to give them the right psychological set to be relaxed but to stick to only one language. Had she done so, there is little doubt that they would have used even less English with her than with me. Appendix II contains a tabulation of all the interviews in which an appreciable amount of language mixing occurs.

Another possible index to language dominance is the frequency with which a particular speaker uses the opposite language in his response to either a question or a statement made by another person.

Table B contains a tabulation of the total number of such responses in the interviews listed in Table A:

TABLE B: Responses to Questions or Statements

	Span. Resp. to Engl.	Engl. Resp. to Span.
Lupe	34	9
Cons	4	37
DL	6	0
Car	2	0

It is interesting to note that Lupe responded in Spanish to something either Consuelo or I said in English over eight times as often as Consuelo did, and Consuelo gave an English response to Spanish three times as often as Lupe did. The fact that neither Carmen nor I ever responded in English to a Spanish utterance can be attributed largely to our desire to get the informants to speak Spanish as much as possible. The statistics for these responses are also included in the data in Appendix II.

The mixing of English and Spanish by the children was not included in the preceding discussion because the interviews were not entirely satisfactory. As Roy explained to me, it is "too hard" to speak Spanish in a situation in which English would appear to be appropriate. Nevertheless, with more time to become better acquainted with the children, either Carmen or I could surely have gotten them to feel completely relaxed and speak with ease in a Spanish interview, because they were friendly and helpful and apparently were not unduly inhibited at any time in our presence. A large enough sample of their Spanish was collected, however, to justify some speculative analysis. Statistics on the incidence of English and Spanish in their speech are included in Appendix II.

Two tapes were made with the children speaking Spanish. The first one, about five minutes long, consists of three of the children telling stories to Gail Smith, who had conducted two very successful interviews with them in English, but who cannot speak Spanish though she can read it and understand it when spoken fairly slowly. Sally, the eight-year-old girl, demurred when her turn came. The second tape is a topical interview about fifty minutes long conducted by

Carmen Reyna. Robert, the nine-year-old boy, was not feeling well and did not participate in the second interview.

The number of English words used by each child is a good indication of how ill-at-ease he was in the interview for various reasons, but it should not be interpreted as an indication of his knowledge of Spanish. See Table C.

TABLE C: Words Used by the Children

		English	o/o	Spanish	o/o
VII	Rach	74	43	97	57
	Roy	48	34	93	66
	Robt	20	7	282	93
XIII	Rach	20	4	481	96
	Roy	145	42	202	58
	Sally	118	30	269	70
	Car	10	.7	1499	99.3

One might assume from studying the data that the age of each child has a lot to do with his linguistic behavior in these interviews, though with this study being as limited as it is, I have had to rely rather strongly on my impressions about them as I observed them during each of the four visits in their home. Many interviews with these and other children would be necessary for more than rather speculative comments. Rachel, who is twelve, is becoming very much "the young lady" and appeared to be drawn very strongly to both Mrs. Smith and Miss Reyna. Thus, she had a great deal of difficulty forcing herself to speak a language that Mrs. Smith could not speak, but she quite readily spoke the native language of Miss Reyna and did so with no apparent difficulty. Robert appeared to be very much "Daddy's boy" and entered into the task of telling a story in his family language with much enthusiasm but still had difficulty talking a language foreign to Mrs. Smith, whom he also liked very much. (On the first visit he gave her a piece of his art work as a gift.)

Roy revealed no overt signs that could be used to interpret his linguistic behavior, but his playing Little League baseball suggests that he has become rather strongly oriented toward the dominant element of the local culture and thus might be subconsciously suppressing Spanish as a means of communicating with people outside the immediate family or peer group.

The statistics on the number of sentences in each language show the nature of the language switching that the children were undergoing as they told their stories:

TABLE D: Sentences in Interview VII

	E	o/o	S	o/o	M	o/o	Total Sentences	Total Words
Rach	1	6	2	13	12	81	15	171
Roy	2	18	3	27	6	55	11	141
Robt			14	56	11	44	25	302

The reason for the high number of words per sentence is that they made many false starts and repeated many words; the repeated words were counted so as to indicate the frequency of hesitations and repetitions. Rachel had 35 words in her repetitions and false starts, 28 of which were English, thus reducing the percentage of English words in the intended story to 33 per cent; Roy had 19 in his, 17 of which were English, adjusting his intended story to 25 per cent English; Robert had 26, four in English, adjusting his to 6 per cent English. Of the remaining 16 English words in Robert's story, 8 were bear or bears (he never did use the word oso); thus, adjusting for this one word, one might argue that only 3 per cent of the words in his story were English.

Representative examples are given here, with all their repetitions and hesitations, to demonstrate exactly what Roy meant when he said that it is hard to speak Spanish in such circumstances:

(71) RACH: Uh ... They [the lions] were ... they were nice to him [Daniel] and all, and then ... he ... él vino ... a nice man and todo eso, ... and ... (sighs) ... y 'pues [después que] los quitaron, él ... él ... he ... él became on good con Jesús y todo eso.

(72) ROY: They wouldn't ... they didn't believe in ... uh ... no creían en Jesús and then He sent this man, este hombre pa' ... dijo que ... que if he didn't ... that ... si no quería (creía) en Jesús que juía (fuera).

(73) ROBT: Su 'amá hizo 'tole (atole) ... eh ... uh ... tres bowls ... soperas, y un ... un bear ... dijo que 'taba bien caliente y la 'amá dijo que 'taba bien caliente también, y el ... el chiquito bear dijo que 'taba bien cold ... frío.

In relating the story Robert's memory of the details apparently got ahead of his telling of it and he collapsed the bears' and Goldilock's comments about the soup into one long but highly inaccurate indirect quotation. This segment of uncomfortably contorted phrasing is not by any means representative of Robert's true linguistic competence or his knowledge, for in other interviews he would often correct or add details when the other children were telling stories or just talking. After the ordeal was over, the research team felt somewhat guilt-stricken for having posed such an unnecessarily difficult task for the children. For the sake of perspective, it should be pointed out that repetitions and false starts are not uncommon even in adult speech and are quite prevalent in all children's speech, though there clearly are more than the usual number in these examples. If one edits the sentences and deletes the false starts and repetitions in these three examples, the sentences are much easier to read, but they still contain some nonstandard and stylistically immature constructions:

(71) RACH: They were nice to him and all, and then él vino a nice man and todo eso, y después que los quitaron él became on good con Jesús y todo eso.

(72) ROY: No creían en Jesús and then He sent este hombre, y [Jesús] dijo que si no creía en Jesús que juía.

(73) ROBT: Su mamá hizo atole--tres soperas--y un bear dijo que estaba bien caliente y la mamá dijo que estaba bien caliente también, y el chiquito

bear dijo que estaba bien frío.

As the statistics in Table D reveal, the task of speaking Spanish was made much easier for the children in Interview XIII, when Carmen was interviewing them. As in interviews with the parents, there was some rather automatic mixing of English and Spanish, particularly when the topics had non-domestic overtones. It is interesting that the relative amount of English and Spanish that Rachel used in Interview XIII is rather close to that of her parents when I interviewed them in Spanish in Interviews III and VIII-B. One would guess, one the basis of his performance on Tape VII, that Robert would also have used Spanish more than 95 per cent of the time. The relative frequency with which each responded in the opposite language also is parallel to the figures shown for the adults in Table B:

TABLE E: Responses to Questions or Statements

	Span. Resp. to Engl.	Engl. Resp. to Span.
Rach		1
Roy	2	11
Sally		10
Car	7	

A representative passage is given here to show the nature of the mixing in the children's speech:

(74) CAR: Cuéntame del juego.
ROY: Primero they were leading diez pa' nada.
CAR: Mmm. ¿Diez a nada? ¡Isssh! ¿Y luego?
ROY: Then there was our team to bat and we made ... 'cimos dos carreras. And then ellos fueron a batear. Hicieron una and then nojotros 'cimos cinco. Después 'ciron six, 'ciron cinco.
SALL: Siete.
ROY: And then they made dos and then it was our time to bat and we made ...
CAR: ¿Cuántas?
ROY: Ah ... five or six. And then they beat us by five runs.

CAR: ¡Ay! ¡Ay! ¿Cómo te sentiste?
ROY: No muy bien.
CAR: ¿Mal? ¿Por qué?
ROY: Porque ellos nos ganaron.
CAR: Les ganaron. ¿Y les van a ganar ustedes?
ROY: Yo no sé.
CAR: ¿Quieres ganar?
ROY: Sí.

After he had told about the English-environment baseball game, Roy had no marked tendency to mix the two languages; it should be noted also that in his description of the baseball game he used *carreras* as well as *runs*, *batear* as well as *bat*, *ganaron* as well as *beat*, and numbers in both languages. Thus, as with the adults, linguistic competence is not the principal parameter in the processes underlying the mixing of the two languages.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

By Donald M. Lance

Though the papers in this report are written as self-contained individual studies, with conclusions stated and implied therein, it should be worthwhile to reiterate the major findings here and make further observations on the basis of what has been learned from the entire project. One of its effects on me is that it has revealed very graphically how amazingly complex language and linguistic behavior are.

Paper I, in discussing the experiences of the research team in engaging the informants in conversation, points out some of the sociological implications of speaker-listener relationships. When the speaker and listener know two languages, the variables in the sociolinguistic interaction between them are increased considerably, for inevitably each language has a rather complex social role--that is, certain judgments are made about people on the basis of the language or languages they speak and the particular language being spoken at the moment of judgment. Language alone, of course, is not the only factor. Age, social position, and the intangibles of the attitudinal approach each uses in maintaining communication with the other determine whether each person addresses or responds to the other with ease, discomfort, difficulty, reserve, openness, bluster, pride, self-assurance, taciturnity, stubbornness, loquaciousness, etc. But the use of a different language or dialect sometimes can add an even stronger variable. For example, the children's willingness to speak with me at all was determined by the usual factors, but they apparently expected me, an Anglo, to speak only English and to expect English in return and found it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to speak Spanish with me. On the other hand, their grandfather has had more experience with friendly Anglos who speak Spanish and felt much more comfortable using that language with me. The two women, who considered me in their own age group, even felt relaxed enough to use a mixture of the two languages with me, though it was not quite the same mixing that they use when speaking just with each other. Different sets of variables determined the openness with which the children talked with Mrs. Smith in English and the relative reserve with which they talked with Miss Reyna in Spanish.

The examples and overall argument in Paper II show rather clearly that the cause of the nonstandard English usage of bilinguals is not only Spanish interference but also language development, particularly in the children, and the use of dialect forms that are also common throughout the Anglo and Negro communities of the area. As Paper IV shows, the clearest cases of direct, on-the-spot language interference experienced by the children is in their use of Spanish.

Paper III lends support to the findings of Paper II in showing how the English of the migrant children in the González study likewise reveals less evidence of Spanish interference than one might expect. The migrant children made many types of errors that the Dominicans did not make, and vice versa; also, the type of error with the highest incidence was not the same one for each group. Thus, the learning problems for students learning English at different ages were found to be quite different. One can only speculate as to why the differences occur--whether the principal factor is the stage of language development one has reached in his native language, the ease or difficulty (for whatever reason) with which people learn certain semantic distinctions, the "openness" or "closedness" of the mind to certain morphological and phonological data, the amount of English one hears in domestic environments, the usefulness he perceives the target language to have, or something entirely different.

Paper IV shows in detail how closely the Spanish of these informants fits into the development of the Spanish language in general. Granted, in Texas Spanish there are many lexical borrowings and, as in any part of the world, regional terms with a small geographical distribution, but a point not often made is that the morphology, syntax, and phonology of the local dialect differ from Academy Spanish in much the same way regional and social class dialects of English differ from the King's English. Texas Spanish, then, has not been "corrupted" simply because of the speakers' not having much education or from their use of English, but rather it has developed in much the same way--and from the same sources--as other Spanish dialects spoken elsewhere by people of the same relative educational background.

Paper V presents detailed evidence that when Mexican-Americans mix English and Spanish together in the same sentence the result is not, as some have claimed, a creolized language but instead a very relaxed and arbitrary switching of codes, both of which are available for use at any time. The switching occurs not because the speaker does not know the right word but because the word that comes out is more readily available at the time of production. If creolization has occurred at all, it has done so in the form of the English pronunciations and constructions that seem to be handed down from one generation to the next. These have generally been regarded simply as interference, and that is the basis for their occurrence; but they cannot accurately be called creolization because the speakers still use Spanish as a completely separate code and there is considerable variation in the amount of "interference" found in the language of different speakers.

The major implication of the findings of this study--as in all others, I suppose--is that more research is called for. From a theoretical and dialectal point of view, it would be very much of interest to conduct a comprehensive investigation of the dialects of Spanish spoken throughout the Southwest. Ideally, this study should be done in conjunction with a similar study of dialects in Mexico since so much of the Spanish of the Southwest is a continuation of the dialects spoken by migrants who came to the area from Mexico in the earlier part of the current century. Demographic studies of the communities studied would also be needed so as to determine the areas of Mexico or the United States that the informants' and their neighbors' ancestors came from. Phonological developments such as [s]~[h] are of interest not only as dialectal phenomena but also as a possible key to, in this case, the redundant features of the Spanish /s/ that make this phonological alternation a plausible one.

A number of studies--that is, close analyses--such as the one in Paper III should be conducted with bilingual speakers of various age levels in order to make a better assessment than has been possible in the past of the gramatical and syntactic features of English that need special instruction if the student is to master standard English with a minimum of difficulty. At the same time, more detailed studies need to be made of the English of bilingual speakers in order to determine the amount and nature not only of the interference that comes from Spanish but also of the dialect interference that comes from the "English with an accent" that is spoken by the Mexican-American community.

Perhaps something should be said about effecting a change in the attitudes of both Mexican-Americans and Anglos toward the language and culture of the people under scrutiny, but nothing of this nature should have to be said. If the studies here are conducted in the spirit of intellectual honesty, then they will be conducted and interpreted as dealing with an aspect of human behavior--communication--that is noble, legitimate, and worthy of respect as such, and the high regard accorded to the subject of study would also accrue to the human beings, separately and as a group, who are being studied--that is, if the study is objectively and humanely pursued.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF INTERVIEWERS AND INFORMANTS

A. Interviewers

1. Donald M. Lance, Ph. D., Principal Investigator
   Assistant Professor of English
   Texas A&M University
2. Gail McBride Smith, Graduate Assistant
   Doctoral Student in English
   Texas A&M University
3. Barbara Taylor Ward, Graduate Assistant
   Doctoral Student in English
   Texas A&M University
4. María del Carmen Reyna, Secretary
   Undergraduate Student (graduating senior)
   Texas A&M University

B. Informants in Bryan

1. Grandparents (interviewed by Dr. Lance)
   - a. David
     - (1) Age: 58
     - (2) Formal Education: none
     - (3) Occupation: carpentry and yard work
     - (4) Birthplace: Alice, Texas
     - (5) Length of Residence in Bryan: about 15 years
     - (6) Father's Birthplace: Nuevo Laredo, Mexico
     - (7) Mother's Birthplace: Monterrey, Mexico
   - b. Rosa
     - (1) Age: 55
     - (2) Formal Education: none
     - (3) Occupation: housewife
     - (4) Birthplace: Hondo, Texas
     - (5) Parents' Birthplace: near the Rio Grande River, in Texas, exact location not known by Rosa
2. Second Generation (interviewed by Dr. Lance and Mrs. Smith)
   - a. Sotero, son of David and Rosa
     - (1) Age: 33
     - (2) Formal Education: 4 years
     - (3) Occupation: semi-skilled employee at a soft-drink bottling plant
     - (4) Birthplace: Poteet, Texas
     - (5) Boyhood Home: San Antonio, Texas

- b. Lupe, Sotero's wife
    - (1) Age: 28
    - (2) Formal Education: 3 years
    - (3) Occupation: maid
    - (4) Birthplace: Houston, Texas
    - (5) Length of Residence in Bryan: anout 18 years
    - (6) Parents' Birthplace: Mexico, cities not known by Lupe
- c. Lidia, Sotero's sister
    - (1) Age: 16
    - (2) Formal Education: in the 9th grade
    - (3) Birthplace: San Antonio, Texas

3. Third Generation, all born in Bryan (interviewed by Mrs. Smith and Miss Reyna)
    - a. Rachel
        - (1) Age: 12
        - (2) Education: in the 5th grade
    - b. Roy
        - (1) Age: 11
        - (2) Education: in the 4th grade
    - c. Robert
        - (1) Age: 9
        - (2) Education: in the 2nd grade
    - d. Sally
        - (1) Age: 8
        - (2) Education: in the 2nd grade
4. Neighbors
    - a. Consuelo (interviewed by Dr. Lance)
        - (1) Age: 39
        - (2) Formal Education: 5 years
        - (3) Ocuupation: housewife
        - (4) Birthplace: Bryan, Texas
        - (5) Data on Her Husband
            - (a) Occupation: upholsterer in a furniture manufacturing plant
            - (b) Birthplace: Marlin, Texas
            - (c) Length of Residence in Bryan: most of his life
        - (6) Father's birthplace: Seguin, Texas
        - (7) Mother's Birthplace: Mexico (died when Consuelo was 6)
        - (8) Stepmother: An Anglo, probably from the Bryan area

    b. Judy, Consuelo's daighter (interviewed by Mrs. Smith)
        (1) Age: 8
        (2) Education: in the 2nd grade

C. Informants from the Dominican Republic (interviewed by Mrs. Ward)

1. Carlos
    - a. Age: 29
    - b. Formal Education: 3 years at the University of Santo Domingo; 6 months in Israel; 1 year at Texas A&M
    - c. Hometown: Monción, D. R.
    - d. Length of time in the U. S.: 1 year

2. Blas
    - a. Age: 19
    - b. Formal Education: high school; 1 year at Texas A&M
    - c. Hometown: Santo Domingo, D. R.
    - d. Length of time in the U. S.: 1 year

3. Tomás
    - a. Age: 21
    - b. Formal Education: high school; 1 year at Texas A&M
    - c. Hometown: Las Martas de Farfán, D. R.
    - d. Length of Time in the U. S.: 1 year

4. Ruperto
    - a. Age: 25
    - b. Formal Education: 2 years in a college in the Dominican Republic; 1 year at Texas A&M
    - c. Hometown: Duvergé, D. R.
    - d. Length of Time in the U. S.: 3 years

APPENDIX II

INCIDENCE OF MIXING OF ENGLISH AND SPANISH

TAPE	WORD				SENTENCE						RESPONSES	
	E	%	S	%	E	%	S	%	M	%	S/E*	E/S**
IX												
Lupe	484	75	164	25	61	67	13	15	16	18	3	1
Cons	750	89	92	11	70	83	8	10	6	7		2
DL	154	86	25	14	24	84	4	13	1	3	1	
XIV-A												
Lupe	317	48	346	52	61	41	70	47	17	12	22	5
Cons	1294	89	161	11	152	75	34	17	16	8	1	15
DL	410	73	149	27	74	62	36	30	9	8	4	
XIV-B												
Lupe	810	65	415	35	93	59	38	24	27	17	6	2
Cons	1016	95	51	5	110	91	9	7	2	2	2	4
DL	418	88	72	12	51	77	13	20	2	3	2	
XV-A												
Lupe	233	29	567	71	9	11	46	56	27	33	2	1
Cons	248	58	180	42	16	29	27	49	12	22	1	5
XV-B												
Lupe	174	9	1854	91	9	3	213	76	59	21	1	
Cons	180	16	983	84	19	9	161	78	28	13		11
Carmen			829	100			198	100			2	
VIII-B												
Lupe	20	<7	283	93+								
Cons	46	3	1505	97								
DL	5	<1	665	99+								
III												
Sot	2	1+	157	99								
Lupe	18	3	581	97								
Corr	5	<3	179	97+								
DL	12	2+	527	<98								
X												
David	19	1+	1297	<99								
Rosa	1	<1	413	99+								
Lidia	14	<4	375	96+								
DL	16	1+	1251	<98								
VII												
Rach	74	43	97	57	1	6	2	13	12	81		
Roy	48	34	93	66	2	18	3	27	6	55		
Robt	20	7	282	93			14	56	11	44		
XIII												
Rach	20	4	481	96	3	2	113	92	8	6		1
Roy	145	42	202	58	23	23	64	66	11	11	2	11
Sally	118	30	269	70	19	17	84	83	12	10		10
Carmen	10	<1	1499	99+	5	3	434	94	4	3	7	

* Spanish responses to English questions or statements.
** English responses to Spanish questions or statements.
S = Spanish
E = English

M = Mixed

APPENDIX III

A NON-PARAMETRIC STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE WORD-COUNT IN APPENDIX II

By David W. Smith

The purpose of this appendix is to indicate how a statistical analysis of data may be used to bolster subjective conclusions in a survey of bilingual behavior. For this purpose we shall use the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, which is non-parametric, and the percentage of English words used in the first six interviews listed in Appendix II.

The question we wish to answer is the following: "Is there a statistically significant difference between the number of English words used by Consuelo, an English-dominant bilingual, and Lupe, a Spanish-dominant bilingual?" The method of the test is to take n paired samples of the speech of the two informants under the same conditions. We then calculate P_{Ei} and P_{Si}, which are the i^{th} sample proportions for the English-dominant and Spanish-dominant informants respectively. The next step is to calculate the differences in sample proportions, d_i (Table I).

$$d_i = P_{Ei} - P_{Si}$$

The d_i are then arranged in ascending order without regard to sign and assigned ranks from 1 to n (Table II). Now, sum all ranks whose corresponding d_i is negative to obtain the statistic W; here W = 1.

Because it is equivalent to the question asked above, we wish to test the hypothesis $H_o : P_E \leq P_S$ against the alternate $H_A : P_E > P_S$. Rejecting H_o in favor of H_A

indicates that the English-dominant informant does indeed use proportionally more English words than the Spanish-dominant informant.

From theoretical considerations, under H_o we calculate the probability that W is less than or equal to 2 to be .047 (written $P_r(W < 2) = .047$). Hence, for a significance level of .05, from this test we reject H_o since W is indeed less than 2.

After having considered the data, the conclusion that is reached by the statistical analysis is hardly surprising. The advantage of the analysis is that we may make a positive statement, i.e., the English-dominant informant uses proportionally more English words than the Spanish-dominant informant; further the chance that the statement is wrong is only 4.7 percent.

TABLE I

Sample Number	English Proportions		Difference
	Cons	Lupe	
1	$P_{E1} = .89$	$P_{Ei} = .75$	$d_1 = +.14$
2	$P_{E2} = .89$	$P_{E2} = .48$	$d_2 = +.41$
3	$P_{E3} = .95$	$P_{E3} = .65$	$d_3 = +.30$
4	$P_{E4} = .58$	$P_{E4} = .29$	$d_4 = +.29$
5	$P_{E5} = .16$	$P_{E5} = .07$	$d_5 = +.09$
6	$P_{E6} = .03$	$P_{E6} = .06$	$d_6 = -.03$

TABLE II

d_i	d_6	d_5	d_1	d_4	d_3	d_2
VALUE	-.03	+.07	+.14	+.29	+.30	+.41
RANK	1	2	3	4	5	6